



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 2002

No. 93

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Father of all in the human family, open our minds, hearts and imaginations to ever greater compassion for all our brothers and sisters, especially those in most need of Your mercy and our attention.

Let arbitrary boundaries or blinding prejudice not set limits to our concern.

Ward off the pride that comes with worldly wealth and positions of power, that leaders in government and corporate America may be Your instruments to establish equal justice and stability in this Nation.

Give Members of this House the courage to open themselves in love to the service of Your people now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MYRICK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3971. An act to provide for an independent investigation of Forest Service firefighter deaths that are caused by wildfire entrapment or burnover.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 997. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research, monitoring, management, treatment, and outreach activities relating to sudden oak death syndrome and to establish a Sudden Oak Death Syndrome Advisory Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minutes on each side.

WORKING TOGETHER

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, our chaplain just spoke of opening our hearts with love in this country and solving some of our great dilemmas, homeland security, the fight against terrorism and, yes, corporate responsibility.

I hope the other side of the aisle listened to that prayer carefully because I think what we need today is people to open their hearts with love and kindness, thinking about the American economy and our citizens and their 401(k)s and their futures. Rather than pointing fingers at the President and Vice President CHENEY, let us work together to solve the problem.

On April 24, we sent over a bill to the other Chamber that passed 334 to 90; 119 Democrats voted for it. It is about accountability. It is about establishing a good audit committee. It is about peer review and oversight to ensure corporations factually report their numbers, but it has languished because the majority leader does not have time for the

important bills that face this Nation, and he happens to be a Democrat.

All of a sudden when it breaks in the headlines, he is in a panic and he is asking everybody to rally around the Democratic bill.

There is a bill on his desk. There has been a bill on his desk since April 24. Wake up, smell the coffee, get that bill passed, and we will restore moral order.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Chair would remind the Member that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and avoid characterizing Senate action.

SANTA ANA KIWANIS CLUB CONTRIBUTION TO LITERACY

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the Santa Ana Kiwanis Club for its efforts to curb illiteracy in my district. The Kiwanis Club has donated \$5,000 to the Orange County Board of Education to finance the printing of 20,000 bilingual booklets that encourage parents to read to their children. The aim of the booklets is to increase the listening and the verbal vocabularies of children, both of which help to improve reading abilities.

I am thankful that my parents took the time to read with me while I was growing up. Their dedication to my education helped me to improve my reading ability and to get good grades in school. My parents knew that success in the classroom and in life depended on a grasp of basic life skills like reading, and I commend the Kiwanis Club of Santa Ana for their efforts to improve literacy among the children of Santa Ana.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4499

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, since 1971 taxpayers have subsidized Amtrak to the tune of \$25.3 billion, yet they have not received a reliable or efficient mode of transportation in exchange for 31 years. Amtrak has not made a profit.

Almost since its inception Amtrak has hemorrhaged money in all directions, particularly on many of its routes. Of the 40-plus routes of Amtrak, only two are profitable. Its worst performing route, from Los Angeles to Orlando, loses \$347 per passenger, meaning it would be cheaper for Amtrak to keep the train on the platform and buy its passengers airline tickets. Last year, Amtrak ended the year with a record operating loss of \$1.1 billion and a \$5.8 billion backlog in maintenance and repair.

Despite receiving Federal funds totaling \$5 billion in the last 5 years, Amtrak has made no progress toward achieving self-sufficiency and is in a weaker financial condition than in 1997.

It is time to wean Amtrak from the public trough. Amtrak gets my Porker of the Week Award this week and it ought to get the Porker of the Week Award for several decades, as a matter of fact.

WORKING TOGETHER ON A BIPARTISAN BASIS

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, so much corporate malfeasance, so little time, so much to do. I join with the earlier speaker in saying that we should work together on a bipartisan basis, and indeed this House did pass a bill in April, but it passed a bill in which virtually every Democratic amendment was rejected out of hand, rejected on a partisan vote.

So we do not have a bill that requires the SEC to actually read the financial statements of the largest companies and make sure that they are not misleading or obtuse.

We do not have a requirement that audit firms have malpractice insurance or that they require their technical review partners to sign off on their audits.

What we have is a bill that is bipartisan in form only. Working together is not just working with the other body. It is working with both sides of the aisle.

Let me also take this opportunity to commend the Financial Accounting Standards Board whose slow and ineffectual action makes the House and the Senate look effective by comparison.

CONGRATULATING MARTHA DE NORFOLK

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Martha De Norfolk, a single mother in my congressional district who has worked to found and maintain the Arthrogryposis Foundation. In order to help her disabled child Bryant Amastha and other local children, Mrs. De Norfolk has dedicated her time and effort to the success of this foundation.

One in every 3,000 babies is born with arthrogryposis, which limits the motion in joints and causes severe muscle weakness. In the classic case of this disease, hands, wrists, elbows, shoulders, hips, feet and knees are affected.

Most people with this disease are of normal intelligence and are able to lead productive lives. However, if not treated through physical therapy or surgery, this disease can become fatal as the body deforms so that internal organs are unable to function properly.

With the help of the foundation that my constituent Martha De Norfolk is working to establish, children suffering with this disease will soon have financial assistance and support groups on which to depend, and local doctors will have access to education on this disease and its treatment, and that is why I congratulate her today.

CORPORATE EVILDOERS ABROAD IN THE LAND

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida talked about the phony reform that was passed by this House and the fact that the Senate will not take it up. Thank God for the Senate.

That was a phony reform. It was written by the securities industry. It was written to touch them with a feather duster. Now there are corporate evildoers abroad in the land, and they have stolen and diverted billions, bankrupted firms, thousands of hard-working Americans have lost their jobs, millions of seniors' savings and pensions evaporated, and even the President has noticed.

He went to Wall Street to admonish his corporate contributors not to do it again, but not to worry, Harvey Pitt, the former security firm lobbyist, has been named to head the enforcement agency, but he did not go to the President's speech because he was on vacation at the beach hobnobbing with the same corporate evildoers he is supposed to be investigating, his former clients. We do not have to worry about a thing, I guess.

WORKING TOGETHER TO STOP ACCOUNTING SCANDALS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the stock market took its sharpest dive since last fall. Some of the major indexes are lower than they have been since 1998.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, is not that the economy is not strong. GDP grew at a rate of 6.1 percent last quarter. The reason is that a handful of dishonest executives got greedy during the heady days of the nineties. They began to lie and deceive in order to make it look like their companies were making more money than they actually were. By lying, they kept their stock prices up and made themselves rich.

Even though only a few companies were involved, investor confidence has suffered severely. The President has a tough and sensible plan to punish the wrongdoers and make sure this does not happen again.

The House has already acted on parts of the President's plan. There is only one thing standing in the way of fixing the problem: Politics, Mr. Speaker. Our friends on the other side of the aisle, especially in the other body, are intent on trying to blame this President and Republicans for what happened on their President's watch.

This is not about blame, Mr. Speaker. It is about fixing a problem. Just once we ought to put politics aside and get the job done.

WE NEED A STATE DEPARTMENT THAT FIGHTS FOR OUR CITIZENS

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, my mother used to tell me where there is a will, there is a way. Last month, the Committee on Government Reform held a hearing on U.S. women and children who are being held in Saudi Arabia, and that continues to play out in the news. While the situation in Saudi Arabia obviously deserves attention, the issue of international child abduction exists in countries all over the world. Right now, and my colleagues have heard the story that I am telling about Ludwig Koons who is being held in Italy, one of our closest friends. Ludwig Koons is a young boy who has been there in Italy for 8 years being held by his mother in a pornographic compound, and the Italian authorities and our State Department did nothing essentially to help.

For years I have been working with left-behind parents who are trying to get their children back where they belong, and for years I have witnessed a State Department that does nothing tangible to help. We need a State Department that fights for United States citizens, not an idle information agency.

This issue is one that none of us can afford to ignore. Be aware, put pressure on those other countries that are not

sending their children home. American parents are asking for someone to help and help them bring their children home. If the State Department had the will, they would find a way to bring our children home.

BALANCED ENERGY POLICY VITAL TO AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the House and Senate conferees to reach a compromise on energy legislation that President Bush can sign into law this Congress. In this time of war, we forget about that sometimes a balanced energy policy has never been more vital to America's national security.

□ 1015

In fact, it is long overdue. It is estimated that we import about 60 percent of our energy, much of which comes from hostile parts of the world. When the American people are confronted with quotes from Saddam Hussein urging other nations to use oil as a weapon against the United States, the pressing need for an energy bill cannot be any clearer.

A balanced energy policy is also crucial to spur a much-needed economic rebound. Less reliance on foreign energy imports and increased domestic production would create hundreds of thousands of jobs for the American people. That is jobs in this country.

I urge my colleagues to reach a compromise and pass this legislation. It will protect and revitalize our national and economic security.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our economy is built on the honesty, integrity and transparency of our financial institutions. Over the years, weakened Federal regulation of accounting practices has allowed corporate greed to run rampant and has led to the failure of some of our largest businesses. When these businesses fail, thousands of employees lose their jobs and pensions while corporate executives become rich. These captains of industry do not stay with a sinking ship, they jump off first, and they jump off with all the treasure.

This is not a simple problem of a few bad apples; the problems are systemic, and we need major changes in our country's accounting practices of our corporations.

What is important to remember is that when corporations fail, workers lose their jobs, families hit hard times and children suffer. There must be a

zero tolerance for corporate corruption.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, corporate responsibility and personal integrity is on the minds of most Americans. After all, honesty and integrity have always been the backbone of our American way of life.

When I was a young girl, I used to frequently see my dad seal a business deal with a handshake, which he always honored. There sure is not a lot of that going around today, is there?

We, the Members of Congress, have an opportunity to play an important role, beyond our usual duties, in determining the future direction of America. We have a very clear choice of either being examples of steadfast integrity or continuing to just be more examples of the lack of integrity we see so much of today.

Which will it be?

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, why was President Bush's speech on Tuesday so badly received? Why did worker after worker who attended the speech just say it was mere politics and not substance? Why did the market drop hundreds of points after the President made his speech on Tuesday?

It is because of a lack of confidence in the Bush-Cheney team that it will demand accountability from its big contributors on Wall Street and its CEO friends; because of the coziness that the Bush-Cheney team have with wealthy interest group after wealthy interest group.

Let me give an example. Three weeks ago, President Bush and House Republicans trooped off to a big fund-raiser where the prescription drug industry gave \$2 million to the Republicans. The next day, on a party-line vote on amendment after amendment, the consumer side lost and the drug industry side won.

The oil industry is writing energy legislation for the Republicans, the chemical industry is writing environmental legislation, Wall Street is writing Social Security privatization legislation, the insurance companies are writing Medicare privatization legislation, and the pharmaceutical companies are writing prescription drug legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it must stop.

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR NEW ETHIC OF RESPONSIBILITY

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of President Bush's plan to cut down on corruption in America's corporate community. The President's plan creates tough new criminal penalties and enforcement provisions to punish those who refuse to play by the rules.

This is America, and those who break the law and threaten the integrity of our financial markets must pay the piper and return their ill-gotten gains.

Mr. Speaker, the House earlier this year took steps to codify the President's plan into law, even before his address on Wall Street. On March 7, the President first said that CEOs or other corporate executives should not profit from erroneous financial statements. He also said that corporate officers who clearly abuse their power should not serve in the leadership of public companies.

The House overwhelmingly passed a bipartisan accounting reform bill in April that included both of these initiatives. When the President called, the House responded.

As we continue to install a new ethic of corporate responsibility, we must strike the right balance between empowering the SEC to do a better job and not overregulating or tying ourselves up in unnecessary red tape. At the end of the day, we must punish the crooks, not the honest brokers.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, corporate responsibility. Well, my colleagues, Enron got away with robbing thousands of pension holders from their life savings, and millions of Americans are watching us, waiting to see why there is a double standard. Why is it that someone who walks into the local grocery store, who picks up maybe a box of Cracker Jacks gets thrown into jail and the CEOs that rob thousands and millions of people, pensioners and retirees, of their life savings do not have anything going against them. No record, no nothing. They are let off with hardly a scandal.

The other thing I want to bring up is, why are we allowing for corporate America to get away with not paying for the pollution that they create in our waters, in particular Superfund sites? I have two Superfund sites in my own district now, and I ask why is it that we are giving them a break to get off the hook? It is not fair for our communities.

Why should the consumers and the taxpayers that I represent have to pay for corporate America's mistakes and mishaps? We ought to use a big stick, not a pillow, and we ought to talk big and make punishment real for those people that break the law.

TRIBUTE TO ALFRED L. WATKINS

(Mr. ISAKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand today and pay tribute to a man of great vision in my district, Alfred Watkins.

Twenty years ago, he took over the leadership of a brand-new high school in my community. He built a music program from 78 participants to the largest music program in public education east of the Mississippi River. His children have won the John Philip Sousa Award, the Louis Sudler Flag Award, a Grammy for the best music program in a public school, twice marched in the Grand Parade at the Tournament of Roses, the World's Fair, and the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade.

But is his legacy the great music or the great music his children perform? No. It is countless numbers of young people who, through the discipline of participation and through the appreciation of music, are changing the lives of other people all over this country.

Alfred Watkins has been a visionary leader who has been great for our community and great for its children. Dr. Theodore Hesburgh once said, "Leadership requires that you have a vision, for without a vision, you cannot blow an uncertain trumpet." It is ironic that Alfred Watkins was a trumpeter, and his music are my district's children, who are a symphony of perfection in my district and in the lives of countless thousands of Americans.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY THREATENS HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House is now throwing themselves as fast as they can at developing a homeland security plan. Somehow, however, we have forgotten half the problem. The problem of the external dangers we all know about, but Pogo, the cartoon character, once said, "We have discovered the enemy, and he is us."

We forget what the internal threats in this country really are. What we have watched on Wall Street is threatening the homeland security of all of us, our pensions, our health care, the economy, and whether we can retire. All those issues are in danger because of, as some of my colleagues say, a few bad apples.

In Washington State, where the apple is really the symbol of the State, we know if you have a bad apple in the barrel, it can ruin the whole barrel. The American people recognize that the barrel has bad apples in it, like the leadership of Halliburton and the leadership of Enron and the leadership of Harken and the leadership of all these companies.

Maybe we should throw some of those apples out of the barrel.

RESPONSIBLE FOREST MANAGEMENT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is summertime, and out West it is the height of the fire season. Every day we ask our brave fire fighters to risk their lives to put out these dangerous blazes. Unfortunately, their job is made more difficult primarily due to extreme environmental groups.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that nearly half of the 2002 projects to reduce wildfires and wildfire risks have been blocked by lawsuits brought by these same extreme environmental groups. These delays have significantly slowed efforts to remove the tinder-dry overgrowth out of our Federal forests and contributed greatly to the West's worst fire year on record. With half of the fire season left, more than 3 million acres have been lost to forest fires and wildfires, lost for all Americans to enjoy, lost for 100 years to come.

Today, the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources will hold a hearing to address this issue. We need to find a way to end the misguided crusade against responsible forest management. Only then will we be able to prevent destructive wildfires that decimate our national forests.

BUSH DISCOVERS IMPORTANCE OF CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, like a preacher welcoming every convert to the fold, we welcome all converts, no matter how belated their interest in controlling corporate corruption.

To date, this Administration's "See no evil, hear no evil" approach has produced and condoned a steady stream of corporate misconduct in this country. So long as more special-interest lobbyists are appointed to fill key regulatory roles and the Administration continues to conspire with House Republicans to undermine every genuine reform that is proposed, the President's newly professed concern amounts to little more than a fresh coat of paint on rotten wood, very rotten wood.

The American people can see right through the thin paint and see the damage that is caused to retirement savings, to investors' earnings, and to taxpayers that are cheated by corporations that use accounting tricks to avoid paying their fair share.

Our patience has been exploited and our trust has been taxed by the cul-

pable inaction, indifference, and complacency of this Administration and its House Republican allies.

LEXINGTON COUNTY PEACH FESTIVAL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is the second largest producer of peaches in the Nation, and yesterday fresh peaches from South Carolina were hand delivered to every congressional office.

I would like to commend the efforts of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, the South Carolina Peach Council, and the interns and staffers for their efforts yesterday in delivering the peaches on Capitol Hill.

Last Thursday, I was honored to be the guest Speaker at the 44th annual Lexington County Peach Festival in Gilbert, South Carolina. This wonderful event is held every July 4th, a time for patriotic families to come together to celebrate the independence of our great Nation. The festival features a parade with wonderful floats and, of course, fresh peaches, peach ice cream, and peach cobbler available for everyone.

I would like to thank all the supporters and organizers of the Lexington County Peach Festival and especially the festival coordinator, Raymond Boozer, along with Gilbert mayor, Phil Price; First Lady Frances Price, and long-time parade coordinator, R. J. Taylor.

My family has attended 32 Lexington County Peach Festivals, and I look forward to many more years of this special July 4th celebration.

□ 1030

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, recent corporate scandals, including Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, Merck, Rite-Aid, Xerox, and so many other corporations have demonstrated the need for our government to take action and bring order, justice, and trust back to our Nation's corporate infrastructure. Criminal practices put in place by high-paid executives demonstrate irresponsibility, hurt investors and employees, jeopardize innocent rank-and-file-worker pensions and retirement systems, and must come to an end.

We need to send strong legislation from this House that will make crooked accounting, cooked financial records, and careless corporate executives a thing of the past.

To do this effectively, we must craft legislation that puts fear in would-be corporate criminals. Stiff prison sentences for white collar criminals are a must and not an option.

High-level executives who have defrauded investors, misled employees, and mismanaged company pension funds must be held accountable.

I support legislation that requires honest accounting, independent investment advice, sensible regulation, and criminal penalties for those guilty of wrongdoing. We cannot have economic growth without eliminating corporate crime.

HIV/AIDS FUNDING

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, the HIV epidemic is making headlines in the international AIDS conference in Barcelona. New projections concerning the disease show there is little good news.

Secretary Thompson leads the U.S. delegation, and I thank him for his recent commitment to work with China to fight HIV. The United States will sponsor collaboration with China using a \$14 million CDC grant for research on HIV prevention and treatment. China currently has over a million cases of HIV, estimated to rise to over 10 million by 2010. HIV has no cure, and prevention is our only means to fight it.

Since the President set a precedent for funding CDC work in China, he should also fund the U.N. population fund. UNFPA provides family planning services in 140 countries, including Mexico, and supports HIV awareness campaigns in 78 countries. The \$34 million approved by Congress for UNFPA is being held because UNFPA works in China, but we are now funding CDC work in China, so it is hard to see the distinction.

Mr. Speaker, we need every tool to fight this lethal disease. Our contribution to UNFPA will help reduce the immigration pressure on the United States, reduce the damage of overpopulation, and slow the spread of HIV. I urge the President to fund both CDC and UNFPA.

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the other evening the President provided a policy speech on corporate accountability. In response to the President's speech, business experts such as John Bogle, founder of Vanguard Group, stated that in terms of real substance of what will solve the problems, it does not get nearly as far as I would have hoped. I agree with Mr. Bogle, Mr. Speaker.

While the President discusses transparency and required disclosures by corporate executives, his own Vice President refuses to disclose which energy moguls sat in the White House and put together our energy policy.

None of us on either side of the aisle should be cavalier about these problems. These are systemic, serious problems. We are not talking about a few bad apples.

When regulators refuse to do their job, the result is that the American people are injured. Just look at the situation with Enron and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Members know Enron was manipulating the system. Lawmakers have been urging FERC to investigate market manipulation long before the Enron scandal broke.

When FERC's chairman, Pat Wood, who was handpicked by Enron's Ken Lay, joined FERC last June, he said it was FERC's job to act like a vigilant market cop walking the beat.

I would say the fox is guarding the hen house. These regulators ought to resign.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, when I was selling football programs at the University of Georgia back when I was in junior high, I was robbed once. Two older kids beat me up and took about \$100. I felt humiliated and violated. Victims of crime, and I have talked to many victims of crime, it is a very personal thing.

But yet when somebody steals a worker's pension plan, their retirement money, or cooks the books and devalues the stock, there is no difference. In fact, I would say the criminals who come out of the closet and beat their victims up and take their money are, if anything, more noble than corporate CEOs who do this behind the books of accounting procedures and fancy talk, and certainly do not follow the general accounting principles.

That is why this House on April 24 passed corporate accountability. There is no difference between ethics and business ethics. Businesses have to operate with honesty and integrity. We need that in society. Too many widows and orphans are counting on their stock to be the value they claim it is worth. That is why people buy it in their retirement account.

I am glad that the Senate is moving on this legislation. We passed it out of the House 3 months ago, but let us get it to the conference committee so we can address corporate accountability. America needs it. Business integrity is important for the prosperity of our country.

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, some corporate executives have been lying and

cheating. They have betrayed their companies, their stockholders, their employees, and the public. I am angry about it. They are as bad as the previous speaker said, as bad as a street punk who mugs someone. It is totally unacceptable behavior.

At the same time, we have to recognize this is just a small fraction of the corporate executives in the country, just as the aberrant priests in the Catholic Church are a very small fraction of that church. Or the number of Members in this body who are accused and convicted of breaking the law are a small number of this body. Nevertheless, their behavior is totally unacceptable, and we have to take action.

It is not simply a matter of changing the law or strengthening the law, although that may be part of it. What we need is enforcement of the law. I am pleased President Bush went to Wall Street yesterday and spoke to them about the need for enforcing the law and enforcing regulations. We must do that. It is not just a matter of punishment, but we also should seek retribution from these highly paid executives who have cheated employees out of their 401(k) accounts, who betrayed stockholders and reduced the value of the company; and not only that, have scared the American public from participating in the stock market.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that our Nation take action against these individuals, both through regulation and enforcement of the law. I hope it happens soon. The American people are angry at this betrayal of the free enterprise system. I am angry about it, and we have to see that something is done about it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2486, INLAND FLOOD FORECASTING AND WARNING SYSTEM ACT OF 2002

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 473

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2486) to authorize the National Weather Service to conduct research and development, training, and outreach activities relating to tropical cyclone inland forecasting improvement, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the

bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 473 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act of 2002. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science.

This is a fair and balanced rule that will afford Members every opportunity to debate the important issue before us.

The underlying legislation will help to improve the capability to forecast accurately inland flooding associated with tropical cyclones. Florida knows the fury of hurricanes all too well, but the damage goes much deeper than that which occurs on our battered coasts.

As storms move inland, they begin to slow and often come to a stop over a particular area. The residents of my district in western Miami-Dade County have seen firsthand the damage that inland flooding can cause. Hurricanes and other tropical disturbances cause homes to flood and streets to become impassable. The danger associated with this type of flooding is a major issue that many Americans are simply not aware of.

This legislation instructs the National Weather Service to develop, test, and deploy an inland flood warning system for use by public and emergency management officials. With passage of the legislation, we will also provide increased training to improve

forecasting and risk-management techniques for inland flooding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It will help protect Americans across the Nation. I urge, accordingly, my colleagues to support this open rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. This is a fair and open rule for a non-controversial bill. H.R. 2486 will direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through the U.S. Weather Research Program, to improve the ability to accurately forecast inland flooding. Additionally, this bill will direct NOAA to develop, test, and install a new flood warning index so that weather service personnel and local meteorologists will be able to explain the dangers of weather emergencies to the public.

Currently, the National Weather Service does not have the ability to accurately forecast coastal inland flooding caused by either tropical cyclones or excessive heavy rains. This legislation gives the National Weather Service the technology to better forecast these natural disasters.

Simply put, the information that will be provided by the National Weather Service to the American public is a vital step towards limiting fatalities and property damage.

As many remember, Hurricane Floyd killed 48 people and caused almost \$3 billion in property damage to inland locations in 1999. One year later, Tropical Storm Allison left areas of Texas with over 35 inches of rain, and then continued its course through the southwest, ultimately leading to the deaths of more than 50 people.

Over the past week, eight people have died and two more are missing as a result of over 30 inches of rain in Texas. According to the Red Cross, at least 48,000 houses have been affected by this rainfall and flash flooding.

□ 1045

The Governor of Texas estimates this damage will cost over \$1 billion. These examples of fatalities and property damage were a direct result of inland flooding.

The New England region also suffers from severe storms that result in devastating inland flooding. In 2000, a Nor'easter hit the coast of Massachusetts, and FEMA and other Federal agencies are still working with families and businesses in central Massachusetts on recovery programs. Based on information gathered as a result of this legislation, families and communities will be better able to plan for these storms. Hopefully this will lead to saving lives and property across the country.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously referred to the House by the

Committee on Science. It authorizes approximately \$1 million annually for FY 2003 through FY 2007. Of that, \$250,000 can be used for merit review grants to colleges and universities like the Worcester Polytechnic Institute and the University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, which are in my congressional district, for improving coastal and inland flooding forecasting.

In order to avoid a recurrence of the devastating results of previous inland flooding, NOAA needs this funding to develop research that will help solve these problems. The bill before us today is an important step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the Committee on Science for their bipartisan work on this bill. I especially want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), for his leadership on this issue. I ask Members to support this open rule and to support the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act. I hope this Congress will not just authorize these important programs, but make sure the funds are made available to carry them out.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards of the Committee on Science.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans do not understand the power of floods until they encounter them. Floods cause an immense amount of damage to this Nation and also cause an average of approximately 100 deaths per year throughout America. Most Americans are not aware of how dangerous they are and do not realize that we lose almost as many people to floods as we do to tornadoes within this country.

Flooding affects every Congressional District in this country. The force of only 6 inches of swiftly moving water can easily knock people off their feet and carry them away into a nearby stream. The force of 2 feet of moving water can sweep cars away.

I am sure all of us have seen night after night on the evening news pictures of cars being trapped in water and we say, how could that happen? How could these people not know the danger? But it fools us. We think it is a small amount of water, but there is so much force that it can easily stall a car or sweep it away and carry it down the river.

The public needs more useful information about flooding, about the nature of floods, the damage from floods, and, most importantly, they need more and better information about when floods are likely to occur.

The bill that is before us, H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act, which came out

of our subcommittee, provides that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, better known as NOAA, will have a \$6 million authorization for a 5-year period to, first of all, develop a new flood warning index that will give the public, the media, and emergency management officials more useful information about the risks and dangers posed by expected floods.

We have done very well in this country in terms of tornado warnings, we have done very well in terms of hurricane warnings, and we have saved not just hundreds, but thousands, of lives over the past few decades with these new warning systems that have been in place. But we have ignored the need to warn people about floods; and not just about the general nature of a flood, but we have to outline roughly the boundaries of the expected flood so people know when to evacuate before the water hits them. So this bill will help develop the new flood warning index that will be understandable by the public, can be easily broadcast by the media, so that we can give warnings out so people will know precisely what to do before the flood hits.

The second aspect of the bill is that it will conduct research and develop, new flooding models, to improve the capability to more accurately forecast inland flooding due to tropical storms. Most people are not aware of the fact that deaths from hurricanes are not from these strong winds that come in from offshore. Most of the deaths are due to floods which occur when the hurricane moves inland and drops huge amounts of rain with resulting flood waters occurring.

It is an excellent bill. I was very pleased to work with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) on this bill. We have perfected it in every way possible. It will serve the people of our Nation well. I urge that we pass this rule and then pass the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the Committee on Rules and appreciate the leadership of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act and urge all Members to vote for this important, truly lifesaving, measure.

Mr. Speaker, when flood water starts to pour through your front door, it does not care if you are a Republican or Democrat, and for this reason I am pleased to be an original cosponsor in working on this common-sense bill with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), and fellow Texan, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

When it comes to hurricanes and tropical storms, the gulf coast of Texas

where I am from is pretty experienced. The hurricane season is something we prepare for, we monitor daily and we have grown to live with.

However, we were hit especially hard by Tropical Storm Allison, and it was extremely difficult to see lives lost and people left homeless in its aftermath. Tropical Storm Allison was the costliest tropical storm in U.S. history, both in terms of life and in property damage. That means homes, things people have worked their lives for. More than 50 people died. The storm caused more than \$5 billion in damage throughout the Southeast United States, but especially in our Houston area, where 35 inches of rain fell in just a few days.

The amount of flooding and the unprecedented damage caused by Allison surprised even the most experienced among us. It has caused our communities to wonder whether we are doing all we can to prepare for and prevent this level of damage in the future.

This legislation is a big step forward in the right direction. It would help prepare residents for future natural events like Allison by finding ways to improve the weather system modeling and early forecasting. It would allow NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to develop an inland early warning index so we would understand how severe these storms could be, and then to train our emergency management personnel in improving these methods.

Here is the key point: Research that leads to earlier, more accurate forecasting is a sound investment, an awfully sound investment. So is finding new ways to alert communities to inland flooding. Flooding affects all of us in the United States, as the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman EHLERS) told us.

In conclusion, I will tell you, no one can control the weather, but we can certainly control our preparation for it. This bill will help provide inland residents with the warning system that raises the awareness of the destructiveness of such storms so we can protect ourselves, our families and our property, as well as ultimately lowering tax costs to the United States taxpayers.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will just simply close by reminding my colleagues that this is a fair and open rule for a good bill, and I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also would urge all of my colleagues to support the rule as well as the underlying legislation, for which the debate will now begin shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the bal-

ance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2733, ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 474 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 474

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2733) to authorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with major manufacturing industries on an initiative of standards development and implementation for electronic enterprise integration. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is an open rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 2733, the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002. The rule allows

for 1 hour of general debate and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science shall be considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment. Priority in recognition will be given to Members whose amendments were preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 2733, the Enterprise Integration Act. The bill authorizes the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with major manufacturing industries to set standards for developing and implementing electronic enterprise integration.

Before the Internet, factories were automated on their own with no consideration of how to share manufacturing data. Factories installed software packages that best met their individual needs or customized software to address particular problems. This resulted in a typical supply chain where suppliers used a variety of different and incompatible software packages.

The burden resulting from incompatible software was more pronounced further down the supply chain as smaller companies had to comply with all the manufacturers higher up the chain. These companies, who must bear the greatest burden, tend to be the ones least able to afford multiple software systems.

However, the Internet and other technological advances have made it possible for manufacturing companies to work together electronically, something that was impossible just a few years ago. This seamless exchange of information, along with the vertical supply chain, is known as enterprise integration.

For example, if Ford Motor Company decided to change a design specification for a bumper, every one of the suppliers that contribute to that part would then have the ability to easily and quickly see the new specification and how it would impact their component.

□ 1100

This integration helps large and small businesses all along the supply chain to reduce costs and productivity times.

A 1999 study commissioned by the National Institute of Standards and Technology estimated that enterprise integration in the auto supply chains of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler would result in a potential savings of at least \$1 billion annually.

This estimated savings from just select companies in the automobile industry is an example. Similar savings are also possible all across other industries such as shipbuilding, major construction, home-building, furniture manufacturing, and electronics manufacturing, just to name a few.

One solution to compatibility problems in design and manufacturing is to develop standards for the exchange of product data. Through this legislation, the NIST, which has 20 years of experi-

ence in this area, will be tasked to work with government and industry representatives to identify and develop ways of enterprise standardization and integration.

The measure also requires NIST to work with companies and trade associations to raise awareness of enterprise integration activities, as well as developing training materials for businesses to participate in an integrated enterprise.

Manufacturers today must be more flexible, efficient, and responsive to the changing needs and preferences of consumers. The European Union understands the importance of enterprise integration and has already been aggressively developing standardized protocols in such areas as I have talked about. In order to maintain and remain competitive to ensure that international standards are compatible with U.S. software packages, the United States must be active in helping to develop these standards.

Mr. Speaker, in this day where technology is so intertwined with our economic prosperity, we must take the necessary steps to streamline our operations and ensure that there is coordination from top to bottom. I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Committee on Science, and the Committee on Science for taking this necessary first step to ensure that our manufacturing industries are not only able to function more efficiently, but also to remain competitive worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to support this fair and open rule, as well as the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the open rule. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is an entirely non-controversial measure that might have been put on the suspension calendar, but nevertheless, it is an important measure for many regions of the country, including my own district in upstate New York, and I urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing sector remains one of the most critical economic engines of the U.S. economy. My region of the country, with a combination of Fortune 500 companies, as well as midsize and smaller firms, has emerged as the leading per capita exporting city in America. Many of our smaller and midsize firms have become the lifeblood of our community and, indeed, have led the Nation in innovation and expansion. These firms know the critical importance of a coordinated exchange of information up and down the supply chain.

With the emergence of the World Wide Web, international standards for

product data exchange greatly accelerated the movement toward electronically integrated supply chains during the last half of the 1990s. European and Asian countries are investing heavily in preparing their smaller manufacturers to do business in the new environment. European efforts are well advanced in the aerospace, automotive, and shipbuilding industries and are beginning in other industries, including home building, furniture manufacturing, textiles, and apparel. This investment could give overseas companies a major competitive advantage in the months and years to come.

The legislation before us today will give the small manufacturers in the United States access to the same electronic integration that the large firms enjoy. The measure would increase efficiency and productivity throughout all sectors of our economy by providing technical and financial assistance to small and medium-sized businesses.

I was pleased to see in this legislation that the National Institute of Standards and Technology would spearhead these efforts. With a long history of working cooperatively with manufacturers, and the nationwide reach which of its manufacturing extension program, the institute is in a unique position to help the United States, large and small manufacturers alike, in their responses on this challenge.

Moreover, the institute will involve the Manufacturing Extension Program, MEP, which I know firsthand is making a real difference in my district. The MEP program, through High Tech Rochester, has assisted more than 1,000 small manufacturing firms within my district. Established in 1987, High Tech Rochester has been a force in the region's economy. By 1997, High Tech Rochester could boast that its client base had collectively realized a 2½-fold growth in employment and a \$43 million increase in sales to \$61 million. Enterprise integration, as provided for in this bill, would provide High Tech Rochester and other successful MEP programs throughout the Nation with a promising new tool to assist the small manufacturing firms.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen what a difference this kind of support can make for not only existing small manufacturers, but for manufacturing start-ups. High Tech Rochester's business incubator supports fledgling small businesses by helping them to spin off, creating new companies to diversify the economy, making it stronger in the long run.

I have been a strong supporter of High Tech Rochester's business incubator program which, over the past 4 years, has successfully supported dozens of start-up companies to ensure that they survive in their first years in business. It has been a tremendous success. In the year 2000, four companies

"graduated" from the facility and moved to new larger facilities in our community. By their graduation, the combined numbers grew from 13 to 61, a nearly 370 percent increase. In 2001, the facility graduated twice as many firms, and we look forward to them doubling the success of their predecessors.

It is my firm hope that other regions of the country will benefit from similar programs, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Grand Rapids, Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the rocket scientist from the Republican Conference.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

In 1994, when I first arrived in this Congress, I was absolutely astounded. I went to my office and, first of all, found that I did not have a computer in my office, but when I tried to use staff computers to send e-mails, I discovered that I could send an e-mail more easily and more rapidly to Moscow than I could to a colleague 20 feet down the hall. Why was that? Because in the House of Representatives, we had allowed a system to develop that did not have standards for the whole House of Representatives, and each Representative had a kingdom where they had set their own standards for their computer systems. Each individual system could not talk to each other.

When the Republicans took the majority, then Speaker Gingrich put me in charge of standardizing the system. Today, we have a system that seamlessly allows over 10 million e-mails a month to flow between offices in this Capitol, saving us a lot of money and a lot of staff time. That is an illustration of what we can accomplish with standards. Without standards, this place barely functioned in terms of Internet usage, e-mail and Web sites. Today, with standards, it functions extremely well, and the American people have access to each and every one of us almost instantaneously, and the American public, through Web sites, can receive information on our activities instantaneously.

This bill is about something similar. It will help industry by setting standards—standards for enterprises working together. Let me give an example.

A smaller auto parts supplier from my district visited me recently. As my colleagues know, in Michigan we make a lot of automobiles and we have many auto parts suppliers around the State. He had a good business. But he commented that he was working very well with the Japanese manufacturer. He was making parts for this manufacturer, who manufactured cars in this country, and they had a good system working together.

Everything was computerized, everything was set up from the beginning so

each side knew exactly what the other was doing, and they could relate to each other well. But with the American manufacturers, they did not have that relationship. They were trying to establish it, but it was going to be different than the one with the Japanese manufacturer, so he was going to have to have two different systems to deal with these two different manufacturers.

That does not make sense, and that is what this bill is about: so that small businesses such as this gentleman's can be assured that whichever manufacturer he makes parts for, he will be able to use the same communication system via the Internet, and that his business will flourish, because it will reduce his expenses tremendously.

This bill will help both large and small manufacturers alike, because it will cut costs and improve efficiency. By taking advantage of information technology such as the Internet and other parameters relating to that, our manufacturing industry will be able to fully integrate their supply chain so information will be able to flow freely up and down the supply chain.

This integration, however, will require the development of standards on how the information is going to be exchanged between businesses within a supply chain. Going back to my example of the small parts supplier working with the Japanese manufacturer and American manufacturer, each of them thinks their own standards are the best. There has to be some outside force that works out the differences and gets agreement.

This bill will provide that outside force by supporting this integration through authorizing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, better known as NIST, to work with industry to identify what research, testing, and development needs to be undertaken to develop these information exchange standards. NIST has been in the standards business for over 150 years. They are experienced at this. They are experts at bringing together different parties and establishing standards, and this is the logical place to put this particular effort.

This legislation provides NIST an authorization of \$47 million over 4 years, starting with \$2 million in fiscal year 2002 and ramping up to \$20 million in fiscal year 2005; and with this money, they will be able to carry out this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this legislation. Small and large businesses in America will benefit from it. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rochester, Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time. I rise in support of this rule and this bill.

There is an old expression that ideas in children are brilliant when they are your own, and we have a problem sometimes with technology because we have one group who has an idea and another group that has an idea, and they begin to speak different languages. What this bill, the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002, is about is ultimately getting everybody talking the same language.

Imagine, for example, if we had a situation where pilots from one airline here in the United States spoke Greek and the next one spoke Latin and the next one spoke German; what we want them all speaking is the same language.

It is said that 50 percent of our economic growth over the next 10 years is going to come from small business. It is also said that more than 50 percent of our economic growth is going to come from technology. This is the way we tie together small business and technology. This is a very, very important bill in the long-term economic future of this country, and particularly for our small businesses here in the United States.

Let me take a minute, though, to say what a wonderful agency the National Institute of Standards and Technology is. I have had the chance to visit two of their campuses, and I cannot tell my colleagues enough how impressed I am with the scientists who work there. The National Institute of Standards and Technology is involved in all kinds of basic research. They study everything from fire to atomic clocks, and they do it very well and they do it on a very limited budget.

□ 1115

In fact, I was so impressed when the chairman and I went out to Boulder, Colorado, to see the way they do business out there at their labs to see how much duct tape they are using in their various labs, and this is very high technology that they are working on. They do not waste any of the taxpayers' money, but what they do best is come up with standards so that various industries are all working on the same language, and the language of science is something that is probably way above my ability to completely understand, and we are delighted to have the good doctor being a very important part of this discussion, but I understand this: if we can get big business and small business, manufacturers and suppliers, all using the same language, both the big business, the small business, the consumer, everyone; the American economy will benefit.

This is a very important piece of legislation. I hope Members will join me in supporting the rule and the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Committee on Rules brought this rule forward. It is great legislation. It makes sense. It will aid not

only small business but encourage the opportunity for big business and small business to be more competitive around the globe. In my prior life, I worked for a company that was called Bell Communications Research, formerly known as Bell Labs. It was our mission at that time to make sure that we ensured the standards for the telecommunications industry were the same across the United States, albeit the world.

The ability to speak together in the same language, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) talked about, is so critical to the success of people who are trying to provide products worldwide. This not only makes sense, what we are doing, but it will help America be more competitive. I wholeheartedly support not only this rule but the underlying legislation. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a great bill; and I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INLAND FLOOD FORECASTING AND WARNING SYSTEM ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). Pursuant to House Resolution 473 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2486.

□ 1118

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2486) to authorize the National Weather Service to conduct research and development, training, and outreach activities relating to tropical cyclone inland forecasting improvement, and for other purposes, with Mr. QUINN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecast and Warning System Act of 2002.

Mr. Chairman, everyone talks about the weather, but no one does anything about it. That is a famous statement I remember from my youth, but I am here today to talk about a way that we are going to do something about the weather.

When it comes to hurricanes, wind speeds do not tell the whole story. Hurricanes produce storm surges, tornadoes, and often the most deadly of all, inland flooding. While storm surge is always a potential threat, more than half of all deaths associated with tropical cyclones during the last 30 years are due to inland flooding.

Inland flooding can be a major threat to communities hundreds of miles from the coast. In 1999, Hurricane Floyd killed 48 people and caused nearly \$3 billion in property damage, primarily because of flooding of inland communities. The severity was quite unexpected because these communities are 50 to 100 miles inland from hurricane landfall. However, this type of flooding has become all too common.

While the National Weather Service has the ability to accurately predict most flood events, it has difficulty in forecasting inland flooding events that are caused by tropical cyclones.

In addition, the flood warning index currently used by the National Weather Service for all flood events does not include enough information about the potential risks and dangers posed by expected floods. This index defines floods as minor, moderate, or major. Sometimes the category is accompanied by a warning of a comparable flood from another year. However, most major floods happen several years or even decades apart, so this information may not be very helpful. We need only to watch the news during the past few weeks as flooding in Texas has caused the deaths of many people.

It is time for a new warning system that will provide more information to emergency managers and the public and will save lives in the process.

This bill, H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act of 2002, provides the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, lovingly known as NOAA, an authorization of \$5.75 million over 5 years to do several things: first, improve the capability to accurately forecast inland flooding, including flooding influenced by coastal and ocean storms, through research and modeling; second, develop, test, and deploy an inland flood-warning index that will give the public, the media, and emergency management officials more accurate information about the risks and dangers posed by expected floods; third, train emergency management officials, National Weather Service personnel, meteorologists, and others regarding the improved forecasting techniques for inland flooding, risk-management techniques, and the use of the new flood-warning index; and, fourth, conduct research, outreach, and education activities for local meteorologists, media, and the public regarding the dangers and risks associated with inland flooding, as well as the use and understanding of the new inland flood-warning index.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

ETHERIDGE) for introducing this important bill. It was my pleasure to work closely with him in perfecting it.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the two bills before us this day coming from my subcommittee were both authored by Democrats, and in both cases I worked very closely with them. That is a good example of the bipartisanship that one experiences on the Committee on Science, and I believe is a model for other committees, as well.

It was the district of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) that suffered the loss of 48 people in 1999 because of the unexpected severe inland flooding caused by Hurricane Floyd. I appreciate his leadership by responding with this legislation, which will help communities to more fully understand the risks and dangers of floods. We worked together closely during consideration of the bill in the Committee on Science to ensure that the new flood-warning index would help all our States, whether landlocked or coastal.

But, more importantly, I am confident that training managers in the use of this new index and educating the public on its meaning and importance will save lives.

This bill received strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Science, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this important and timely piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act of 2002. This legislation was developed by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), who has done a good job on it. He has worked on it for quite some time. I have great admiration for the gentleman. He is from the home State of my father and most of my family. He is a gentleman, and good to work with.

This bill has strong bipartisan support, not only on the committee but among Members from coastal areas, as well. The gentleman from Michigan (Chairman EHLERS) has already outlined the provisions of this bill, so I just want to take a few minutes to talk about the need for this legislation.

Flooding affects, of course, every part of the country; and although we have improved our flood forecasting capabilities, we still lack an effective means of transmitting to the public the nature and severity of a flood.

Mr. Chairman, one day this country will capture and hold the devastating flood waters to fight future droughts in additional lakes, above-ground giant containers, and some underwater storage. Water and fire, fearful enemies, could become wonderful friends for the future to allow these devastating floods to fight the droughts.

One of the least-understood flood patterns is related to tropical storms. For

example, we still do not fully understand the interaction between storm surges and flooding caused by precipitation. As a result, our flood forecasting is often inaccurate. In addition, tropical storms impact not only coastal areas, but can have devastating and disastrous effects as they continue to move inland.

For example, Tropical Storm Allison dumped more than 35 inches of rain on my State of Texas. There were 50 deaths. The flood damage to Houston and surrounding areas was estimated in the several billions of dollars. Just last week, parts of central Texas received more than 30 inches of rain.

In Texas, we have firsthand knowledge about the damaging effects of floods, so I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly support the efforts of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) to develop an improved inland flood-forecasting index. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman EHLERS) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for their strong support of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the so-called Etheridge bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who has firsthand experience with the problems this bill is designed to address, because, as we know, there have been some disastrous floods in Texas the past week.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership as subcommittee chairman on this important issue to our region and the Nation as well. I also especially appreciate the leadership of my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), who have taken such a lead role in this legislation.

When flood waters come through our homes, destroy our businesses, knock out our local hospitals, it does not care if we are Republican or Democrat; it just does the damage. In Houston, Tropical Storm Allison, we are told, was the costliest tropical storm. We lost 50 lives, 50 neighbors in that storm.

We have lost some \$5 billion in our damage to our homes and businesses; and in our medical research center, we lost just tons of research in so many areas, from cancer to genetics, in some of our life-saving research that is being done. Some of the experiments that we lost were 10 years in the making. Scientific experts tell us that there was not a single discipline of science that was not in some way set back from the loss of research from Tropical Storm Allison.

What we heard over and over in our community was that people, families and businesses, were saying, if we only had some notice; if we only had some

warning about this devastation, we could have prevented it, or we could have lessened the damage. This is why I appreciate the lead of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is so commonsense. It says, let us invest in the research which tells us why this flooding is coming and how quickly it is coming, and then let us do an early warning system for us, for those of us in the community, so we know how severe this storm would be on inland flooding and how it could affect us, so we can take those preventive steps.

Then it goes another step and works with our local emergency response people to train them how to respond so they can assist us in leaving that area and preventing that damage, that loss of lives and loss of property.

I am convinced that in our region, which is very experienced in flooding, we were watching for flooding from the coast. We were prepared for the punch from the right; we did not see the punch from the left, from inland flooding. That is what I appreciate so much about this bill.

□ 1130

It takes the inland flooding, provides the research, gives us the warning, trains the communities to prevent. And I am convinced this will save lives, it will save properties, it will save tax dollars to us in the end. It is a compassionate, smart, intelligent investment and the very best next step in preventing inland flooding.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for yielding me time. I also want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and others who have been on the Committee on Science, who have helped so much with this piece of legislation. As the gentleman said earlier, the Committee on Science has a tradition of bipartisanship and this bill is another indication of that bipartisanship at work.

Mr. Chairman, as the 2002 hurricane season begins to heat up, I am pleased that we were able to get H.R. 2486, a bill to improve the forecasting of inland flooding and develop an inland flooding index on the floor of the House, and hopefully we can get it through quickly to the Senate and on to the President.

I know it seems a bit strange, and if the folks back home happen to be watching this morning, to be talking about flooding when my State and many other States across this country are facing some extreme drought conditions, some of the worst we have seen certainly in our State in almost 100 years. But much of my district desperately needs rain today, and right now they would like to have a little rain to bring some of the plants to life

and replenish our falling water supplies.

However, we in North Carolina know all too well how devastating tropical storms and hurricanes can be. As you have already heard, just 3 years ago in 1999, Hurricane Floyd killed 48 of our citizens. Almost all of them lived hundreds of miles from the coast, and died not from storm surge as we have heard, not from hurricane wind forces, but from flooding caused by the torrential rains associated with the tropical storms. And as we have already heard this morning, the one thing they did not have was time because this storm hit at night. People lost their lives, they lost their property, and many people lost everything they had because they did not have the one thing that would have made all the difference in the world, which was time.

Last year Tropical Storm Allison, as we have heard others talking about already, demonstrated all too effectively the power of these floods, killing more than 50 people in several States, starting in Texas and moving up the eastern coast; and more recently torrential rains have caused major flooding in Texas all over again, killing 12 people. These and other storms clearly indicate that current methods of predicting whether storm rains will produce heavy flooding are insufficient and that flood warnings are tragically inadequate.

Last year, the House Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards of the Committee on Science heard testimony as to the need of improving the inland flooding forecasting and developing a better warning system that raises public awareness on the destructiveness of inland flooding so people can protect themselves, their property and their families.

Ever since Floyd hit my State with such devastating power, I have been working with experts in storm predictions to help develop an effective piece of legislation to respond, and H.R. 2486 is the result of that effort with my colleagues here in the House.

This bill authorizes a small sum in the terms of the dollars we produce, only \$5.75 million over 5 years to provide the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with additional resources to enhance the science of flood prediction and, more importantly, develop an improved, effective flood warning index that really will save lives and warn people. NOAA's forecast for this year calls for the potential of nine to 13 tropical storms in the Atlantic, including six to eight hurricanes with two to three of them to be classified as major hurricanes, Category 3 or higher on the Saffir-Simpson scale.

William Gray, a professor of atmospheric sciences at Colorado State University and a leading hurricane expert, predicts a 75 percent chance of a Category 3 or higher hurricane striking land in the United States this year. In an average year, that chance is only 52

percent, so you can see this year we stand a chance of really getting hit. Let me repeat that. Experts say there is a 75 percent chance the United States could experience another Floyd, another Fran, another Andrew, or another devastating storm hitting the U.S. coast.

When you consider that more than 50 percent of America's population lives in coastal areas around this country, that makes it a frightening prediction. That is why, along with 23 of my colleagues, I have sponsored H.R. 2486, because as our Nation enters what appears to be a period of increasing storm activity, we need to better understand the damages these storms can cause and better inform our citizens of the danger that these storms pose.

I am pleased that this measure has won the bipartisan support of so many of my colleagues on the Committee on Science, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and others. I want to thank the gentlemen, as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), for their help on the subcommittee, for their assistance in moving this legislation forward.

I want to express my appreciation to the staff of the full Committee on Science and the subcommittee on both the majority and the minority side, in particular Mike Quear, Eric Webster, Bob Palmer, Mark Harkins, and Dave Goldston and others who have worked to get this bill to the floor.

I also want to acknowledge the help of the staff of NOAA and the National Weather Service, and cite the work of Dr. Leonard Pietrafesa, a professor at North Carolina State University, who helped in the crafting of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at this very moment a storm is brewing in the Gulf of Mexico that may or may not develop into a tropical storm. Time is of the essence. I encourage my colleagues to pass this with haste, get it to the Senate so the President can sign this legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join the gentleman from North Carolina in commending the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for his good work, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), as well as the staff. They have made the Committee on Science into a smoothly working machine, one of the most productive committees in the House, and I commend all of them for that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I too rise in support of this legislation. I remember very well being a wit-

ness to one of the most devastating floods that ever hit Pennsylvania, and I was reminded of the fact that in Hurricane Floyd, which was just referred to by the previous speaker, many Pennsylvanians went down to help in that disaster; and they did so because they remembered, did these Pennsylvanians, what happened to us in central Pennsylvania in 1972. Agnes, the mother of all hurricanes, swept over Pennsylvania and lingered on top of that topographical area for a long period of time.

We learned many, many different lessons at that time. And one of them was, of course, what is common sense: that the more ability we have to forecast and prepare, the less risk there is to human life and the less risk there is to destruction of property. And that is what the essence is of this piece of legislation.

We are all eager to put into place the highest form of technology possible so that we can have these early warnings and be able to give the warnings that are necessary to residents, to businesses, to everyone concerned, and thereby minimize the damage.

Since Agnes, we have formed a task force with the Susquehanna River Basin in which flood warning is the key element. So we are becoming more and more aware of the new science that can help in flood forecasting and also in the quick recovery from damage and flooding that may occur.

So I rise with great enthusiasm to support this legislation. If it is a matter of common sense, we ought to have a unanimous vote in the Chamber for this piece of legislation. It will reap numbers of thousands of dollars and millions of dollars in savings as we proceed down the line of preparing our populace for natural disasters in the most scientific way possible.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member of the full committee and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for their leadership and, of course, my friend and colleague from North Carolina, the distinguished Congressman who has come forward with an enormously important legislative initiative that deals with inland flooding forecasting and warning system.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important with the changes, climatic changes that we are facing, so many of us who come from very warm climates are used to what the Northeast and the Midwest are facing now over the last couple of years with intense heat over the summer and, in fact, intense heat during some of the winter and fall months.

We know that the weather and prediction of such is coming upon a new turn. And this legislation will be an indicator, a predictor of saving lives and

saving property and saving local government. Having come from a local government situation, being a member of the Houston city council, I am very close to our local officials, both county and city.

Mr. Chairman, if I can express to you a phenomenon that none of us expected to happen, that was the occurrence of June 10 approximately, 2001, where a few days of rain turned into the largest storm that we had ever seen and one that the Gulf Coast had never experienced. There were areas in our communities that were under the 500-year flood warning, under the 100-year flood warning and, unfortunately, received enormous amounts of water in the inner city and surrounding areas.

I remember that morning. It was a Saturday morning. I remember being here at the United States Congress earlier in the week, and as it began to rain and I checked on my constituents in Houston, all they said was, it was heavy rain and I am sure things will be well. It stopped and then started again on Friday night. And, lo and behold, when we arose early that morning, the medical center, hundreds of billions of dollars, under water. Millions and millions of dollars of research lost. Thousands upon thousands of research mice lost. Individuals in that medical center having to be or patients having to be, en masse, evacuated. Literally, the medical center was shut down. Universities shut down. Thousands of homes under water. Twenty plus deaths and all because of Tropical Storm Allison.

The concept of forecasting is imperative. It is imperative for saving dollars in the Federal Government. It is imperative for planning for local governments. It is imperative for helping in our local communities; and, yes, in causing or decreasing the amount of pain experienced by those impacted by these floods.

Right now, as we speak, we know that the Guadalupe River is overflowing in areas that many of the residents in that area never expected. This legislation will go throughout the country to not only areas that are used to flooding in some of the outlying areas, but in the inland areas.

My area happens to be 50 miles inland, but it is also 50 feet under sea level; and it is by a port, it is by waters that might overflow. The idea of forecasting is imperative. So I would ask my colleagues to be particularly sensitive to the importance of this legislation. I look forward to presenting an amendment that will complement this legislation in its structure. I will be looking for long-term forecasting as this legislation has short-term forecasting.

I am very delighted to be able to work with my colleague who had a brilliant idea in seeing this legislation come to fruition. I look forward again to discussing the proposal I have and would ask my colleagues to consider it as I will be giving my enthusiastic support to this legislation.

□ 1145

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the angel of NIST and NOAA.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for that wonderful introduction that I hardly deserve, but this has been a good week for the Committee on Science. It demonstrates again how we work together on both sides of the aisle to do what we believe is in the best interests of scientific research, development, education and what is best for the country.

It is with pleasure that I rise in support of H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Development Act of 2002. Congratulations to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for his leadership on the issue, his willingness to work with members of the Committee on Science. Congratulations to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), the ranking member, as well as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHLERT), chairman, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), ranking member of the full committee, for having this piece of legislation come to the floor today.

Together we have expanded the focus of the original bill to take it beyond North Carolina and other hurricane-prone regions to include the protection of all regions subject to inland flooding due to severe weather events. The Committee on Science has a strong history of bipartisan collaboration, and this bill, as I have said, is yet again another example of how working together we can forge a bill that is much stronger than the original intent.

Each year hazardous weather causes thousands of fatalities and tens of billions of dollars in property damage, largely due to inland flooding. Moreover, the problem appears to be growing. Severe weather events, particularly hurricanes, appear to be cyclical, and we are recently coming off a period of low frequency. The Atlantic Ocean is beginning to enter another active period, and scientists tell us we can expect increasingly frequent events of greater and greater severity.

In addition, the capacity for damage has increased dramatically, as coastal development has continued to boom for the last 20 years. More and more people are living near coastal, estuarine or inland waters, creating a heightened potential for disaster and loss of life.

The improved ability to predict and prepare for severe storm events can have a substantial and immediate impact. Research dollars are desperately needed to protect both the lives and the livelihoods of the millions of Americans who live in regions susceptible to severe inland flooding.

The purpose of this bill is simply to develop, test and deploy an effective inland flood warning index for use by

public and emergency management officials. Managing disasters by predicting their occurrence is much more effective than reacting to their results.

It is a modest bill with modest goals that will have a huge impact. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I actually seldom come to the floor to speak on a bill that I have not had any personal involvement in before it comes to the floor, that does not come through a committee that I sit on, but I wanted to take the opportunity today to come and praise this bill and say that it is a wonderful bill for North Carolina and for the Nation and to say some nice things about the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) who is the sponsor of this bill.

I have been following him for quite a while. We started out in the State legislature together and in the State legislature sometimes, people come up to a person and say, there are people in this body who are destined for other things in life, and we all knew at that time that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) was one of those people.

He went on, after serving in the State legislature, to serve as Superintendent of Public Construction in North Carolina and did an outstanding job there, and the thing that has been characteristic of him throughout this process is his ability to reach across party lines and understand that education and science and all of the issues that we deal with on an ongoing basis really are not Republican or Democrat, they are American issues, world issues, issues that are important to deal with on a bipartisan basis.

This bill is another example of that, where he has recognized a need based on the experiences that we observed in North Carolina as a result of hurricanes, and used that same kind of bipartisan approach and added to try to solve a problem that existed and addressed that need.

I want to applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Science for putting aside, as they always do, the partisanship that so often can pervade this institution, and recognizing the importance of this bill to the people of our country. The problem of inland flooding, I am not sure we were as much aware of until we had a series of floods in North Carolina.

I live in Charlotte, North Carolina, and that is about 150 miles from the coast. I grew up thinking that a hurricane was fed by the ocean and the water and that it really could not come that far inland to impact a community, until Hurricane Hugo came charging right through the center of the city that I lived in and did tremendous damage and devastation to the community.

If we had had better warning systems and research available to detect that possibility, I think we would all have been better served. We would have saved substantial amounts of money, and whatever amount is going to be expended for this important purpose, I think we will more than benefit from it over time, and I applaud the Committee on Science for the work that it has done on this bill in recognition of that fact.

I want to just thank my colleague again for the introduction of this bill, and I thank the gentleman for yielding time for me to say some nice things about my colleague and about the bill and about the Committee on Science.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would observe that at one time my parents lived in Canada and the area north of Toronto suffered tremendously from a hurricane. So we are not safe from hurricanes almost anywhere inland.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will proceed to close.

The preamble to our Constitution specifies as one of the major duties of government to promote the general welfare of its people. This bill is an example of what we can do to promote the general welfare of our people.

This bill will save lives, it will save property, and it will cost very little. In fact, the cost per capita in this Nation of this bill is 10 cents per capita, and I think that is a good bargain. By developing an inland waterway and flooding bill of this nature, that will protect the people of this country, we will save undoubtedly at least 15, probably 100 lives per year and we pay only 10 cents apiece—that is a good deal.

So I strongly encourage this House to pass this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Act of 2002".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through the United States Weather Research Program, shall—

(1) *improve the capability to accurately forecast inland flooding (including inland flooding influenced by coastal and ocean storms) through research and modeling;*

(2) *develop, test, and deploy a new flood warning index that will give the public and emergency management officials fuller, clearer, and more accurate information about the risks and dangers posed by expected floods;*

(3) *train emergency management officials, National Weather Service personnel, meteorologists, and others as appropriate regarding improved forecasting techniques for inland flooding, risk management techniques, and use of the inland flood warning index developed under paragraph (2); and*

(4) *conduct outreach and education activities for local meteorologists and the public regarding the dangers and risks associated with inland flooding and the use and understanding of the inland flood warning index developed under paragraph (2).*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for carrying out this Act \$1,150,000 for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2007. Of the amounts authorized under this section, \$250,000 for each fiscal year shall be available for competitive merit-reviewed grants to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) to develop models that can improve the ability to forecast the coastal and estuary-inland flooding that is influenced by tropical cyclones. The models should incorporate the interaction of such factors as storm surges, soil saturation, and other relevant phenomena.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through fiscal year 2007, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on its activities under this Act and the success and acceptance of the inland flood warning index developed under section 2(2) by the public and emergency management professionals.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 2, line 24, strike “and”.

Page 3, line 5, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 3, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) *assess, through research and analysis of previous trends, among other activities—*

(A) *the long-term trends in frequency and severity of inland flooding; and*

(B) *how shifts in climate, development, and erosion patterns might make certain regions vulnerable to more continual or escalating flood damage in the future.*

Page 3, lines 9 and 10, strike “\$1,150,000 for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2007” and insert “\$1,250,000 for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2005, of which \$100,000 for each fiscal year shall be available for competitive merit-reviewed grants to institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) to carry out the activities described in section 2(5), and \$150,000 for each of the fiscal years 2006 and 2007”.

Page 4, line 4, insert “The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall also, not later than January 1, 2006, transmit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the likely long-term trends in inland flooding, the results of which shall be used in outreach activities conducted under section 2(4), especially to alert the public and builders to flood hazards.” after “emergency management professionals.”.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, again, let me rise, expressing my very strong support for H.R. 2486, the Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Development Act which will save lives and money by improving forecasting, education and by setting the stage to get timely and useful information to the people in the way of big storms and subsequent floods.

Let me also add again my appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and as well to the proponent of this bill, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), who has firsthand experienced the devastation of flooding and has taken this issue up and worked this issue in a way that will help all of America.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, for his support on this legislation and as well his leadership and knowledge about these issues as he has continued to serve on the House Committee on Science.

We come from an area, as I indicated earlier, that knows water and knows it in many ways. We enjoy it. We recreate in it. We make our livings from it in the Gulf Coast of Texas, but at the same time we know of its power. In Harris County, Texas, alone in the past 10 years, there have been five major flooding events, in 1992, 1994, mid-1998, late 1998 and the big one, Tropical Storm Allison of 2001, that individuals 80-years-plus had never seen a flood such as Tropical Storm Allison. Remember, I said a storm and not a hurricane.

Flood waters in Tropical Storm Allison reached heights known as hundred-

year flood levels. These five storms damaged or destroyed thousands of homes and businesses, and so it is imperative that this legislation be passed and that I would offer this amendment that would, in fact, provide a long-term study for a period of 3 years, costing \$100,000.

As it stands, the bill will improve short-term forecasting of cyclones and associated flooding and will provide for the development of a warning system to get minute-to-minute information to the public and to emergency management officials regarding flood dangers. These functions will operate on the time scales of days to weeks, for example, saying there will be a storm this weekend or evacuate our homes now.

My amendment will simply add a long-term component to this important project. This will enable officials to warn people what they might expect over the next 5 years or even the next decades. A small amount of money I am proposing to spend on this long-term component could save billions of dollars and save many lives in the future by providing information to help people make prudent decisions today.

We will have to look at other science in order to determine how we can provide a safe place for people to live and save lives prospectively, but as we move this legislation along, I think the idea of providing a long-term component will be very effective.

In my home district alone in the past 10 years, as I indicated, we have had several storms, and as I indicated as well, the Tropical Storm Allison, the big one, caused an estimated \$5 billion in damage, flooded almost 100,000 homes and killed at least 20 people in our community. Right now, Mr. Chairman, I am still living with those who are suffering from the damages of the flood.

The questions I have are, after the first four floods, why are so many people and homes still in flood zones when the big one hit a year later?

□ 1200

It seems that the first four floods might have let us know that more may be coming soon and people should move to higher ground.

And, two, why have there been so many devastating 100-year floods in rapid succession? In other words, are floods, indeed, becoming more severe over recent years?

I have been asking these questions and cannot find anyone to give me an answer with even a modicum of confidence. It seems that no one knows exactly why this happens; and if they do, they have information that should be shared, whether it is simply a natural variation or if it is due to shifts in development or erosion patterns or climate. And no one knows whether there is a real long-term trend in such major flooding events.

Right now, people in Texas are getting over yet another flood, and they

need to make informed decisions about whether to rebuild their homes. These are life-altering and costly decisions which can devastate communities, families, and neighborhoods, and also break down the spirit.

Some of these people right now are deciding what to do and how to do it after losing their precious resources. It was hearing of their struggles last week that inspired me to write this amendment. The proposed act, as it stands, would have helped those people protect their lives and property before and during the floods, but my amendment would be helping them make tough decisions now by giving them an indication of whether they should expect more frequent or severe floods in the future. It is about planning.

With this amendment, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration would receive an additional \$100,000 only during the first 3 years of the program. This money would fund grants for research at higher institutions to study the long-term trends in flooding to help predict future risk in flood zones.

May I first start by expressing my strong support for H.R. 2486. The Inland Flood Forecasting and Warning System Development Act will save lives and money by improving forecasting, and education, and by setting the stage to get timely and useful information to people in the way of big storms and subsequent floods. The Congressman from North Carolina has been a champion of this issue, and deserves great credit. I am pleased to have co-sponsored the proposed legislation with him.

As it stands, the bill will improve short-term forecasting of cyclones and associated flooding, and will provide for the development of a warning system to get minute-to-minute information to the public, and to emergency management officials regarding flood dangers. These functions will operate on the time-scales of days to weeks, for example saying "there will be a storm this weekend," or "evacuate your homes now."

My bill will simply add a long-term component to this important project. This will enable officials to warn people of what they might expect over the next five years, or even the next decades. The small amount of money I am proposing to spend on this long-term component could save billions of dollars and save many lives in the future, by providing information to help people make prudent decisions today.

In my home district alone, in the past 10 years there have been five major flooding events. In 1992, 1994, mid-98, late-98, and the big one—Tropical Storm Allison in 2001—flood waters reached heights known as "100 year flood levels." These 5 storms damaged or destroyed thousands of homes and businesses. The last storm, Allison, alone caused an estimated five billion dollars in damage, flooded almost 100,000 homes, and killed 41 people nationwide.

The questions I have are (1) After the first four floods, why were so many people and homes still in flood zones when the big one hit a year later? It seems that the first four floods might have let us know that more may be coming soon and people should move to higher ground. And (2) Why have there been so many devastating "100 year floods" in rapid succession? In other words, are floods indeed becoming more frequent and severe over the years?

I have been asking these questions, and cannot find anyone who can give me an answer with even a modicum of confidence. It seems that no one knows exactly why this happened—whether it is simply natural variation, or if it is due to shifts in development, or erosion patterns, or climate. And no one knows whether there is a real long-term trend in such major flooding events.

Right now people in Texas are getting over yet another flood, and they need to make informed decisions about whether to rebuild their homes or relocate to higher ground. These are life-altering and costly decisions, which can devastate neighborhoods or even entire towns.

It was hearing of their struggles last week that inspired me to write this amendment. The proposed Act as it stands would have helped these people protect their lives and property before and during the floods. But my amendment would be helping them make tough decisions now by giving them an indication of whether they should expect more frequent or severe floods in the future.

In my proposed amendment, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration would receive an additional \$100,000 per year, only during the first 3 years of the program. This money would fund grants for research at higher institutions, to study the long-term trends in flooding, to help predict future risk in flood zones.

At the end of the 3 years, a report will be written that will be sent to Congress to report its findings. More importantly, the findings will be disseminated to the public, through the educational outreach already planned in the original bill. This will enable citizens, builders, and planners to make better-informed decisions about where people should live, or stop living.

This amendment has quite a narrow scope. It is not a global warming amendment. It is small, and focuses only on the flooding associated with cyclones which affect a limited region of the country. However, my amendment has a very important target. The amendment is meant to get much-needed information to people who might be in continual danger from escalating flooding. It could also give assurance to those people whose risks of continual flooding might be low.

If insights gleaned from these studies lead to a smarter distribution of homes and businesses, and prevent a tiny fraction of the damage in the next five billion dollar flood—this amendment will earn its pay. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud this legislation, as I close, because it has a

great outreach provision, and this amendment will help with this outreach.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment because it is narrow in scope.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for it. This is something we have worked on together. It is something I had hoped that would happen anyway when this the bill reached NOAA; that they would interpret it this way. But it is good of her to point out that this must be done. This makes things very specific, and we have reached agreement on this amendment, so I am pleased to accept it.

I would just comment that I will have to revise my cost estimate. I commented earlier this bill would cost us a grand total of 10 cents per person in this country. Because of this amendment I have to raise that to 11 cents per person in this country. But I should also make it clear, which I did not before, that that cost is spread over 5 years. So rounding off, it is still 2 cents per person per year for 5 years, and we are getting a lot for our money. But I am very pleased to accept this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. First, let me thank the gentleman very much, Mr. Chairman, for working with our office and, of course, working with the champion of this legislation, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

We come from different parts of the country, and I think it is important to note that Michigan, Texas, and North Carolina all worked together because these issues are far-reaching. And I would simply hope, as the gentleman has been so fiscally responsible, that they can see the amount of money that we will save in the future. Again, I thank the gentleman for supporting this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and I support this gentlewoman. I think we have observed here representation at its very best. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) personally testified to the tragedies that they had experienced in their own hometowns of Houston and Charlotte, and I think it was refreshing to hear the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) express his admiration for a long-time, fellow public servant.

This is the way it ought to be, and I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for going that extra mile, offering this study, a needed study, and I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) accepting it. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2486), to authorize the National Weather Service to conduct research and development, training, and outreach activities relating to tropical cyclone inland forecasting improvement, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 473, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill just considered, H.R. 2486.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 474 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2733.

□ 1210

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2733) to authorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with major manufacturing industries on an initiative of standards development and implementation for electronic enterprise integration, with Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I rise in support of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002.

Much has changed about the manufacturing industry during the past 30 years. In the 1970s and 1980s, our manufacturing sector was in trouble. Plagued by quality problems and inefficiency, our domestic manufacturing sector was on the decline, and it was costing U.S. workers their jobs. I saw this firsthand in my home State of Michigan, when one observer noted in a national column how much Michigan's auto manufacturing sector had fallen and asked for, in print, "The last person to leave the State to please turn off the lights."

This decline served as a wake-up call not only for State and Federal governments but especially for domestic manufacturers, and they have worked hard over the past three decades to become leaner and more competitive in the global marketplace. Automation, outsourcing, efficiency, and quality became the buzzwords of this effort, as manufacturers made fundamental changes to their business models. When these changes were coupled with the information technology revolution, manufacturers were able to unleash the untapped potential of American workers.

Over the past 10 years, our workers increased their productivity as never before in the modern era. These gains led to one of the greatest economic expansions in U.S. history and made a bold statement that U.S. domestic manufacturing was ready to compete in the global marketplace.

Domestic manufacturing industries are now beginning to undertake new steps to ensure that they stay globally

competitive. Our manufacturing industries are moving away from the traditional models where products are mass produced and consumer preferences are aggregated at the end of a manufacturing chain. The new model is marked by a commitment to flexibility, networked supply chains, just-in-time inventories, and responsiveness to changes and customers' preferences. Underpinning all these elements is the need to be able to exchange information quickly, reliably, and without fear that the information contains errors or is incomplete.

The purpose of the legislation before us today is to support this critical component. H.R. 2733 will establish an enterprise integration initiative within the National Institute of Standards and Technology, better known as NIST. At the heart of this initiative is what modern manufacturing industry craves—the ability to exchange information up and down the supply chain without error or loss.

For example, with a fully integrated supply chain, if Ford were to design a change for a bumper, every one of the suppliers that contributes parts to Ford for that bumper would be able quickly and easily to see how the new specifications would affect the component they manufacture. Each supplier would be able to redesign the component knowing that the information used does not have errors and has not lost data along the way.

As I said earlier, the new manufacturing model requires industry to respond to consumer choices quickly and with a high degree of quality and reliability. This flexibility can only be achieved with a fully integrated supply chain.

Two of Michigan's key industries, automotive and furniture, can derive tremendous benefits from this legislation. A 1999 study by NIST found that General Motors, Ford and Chrysler together could save \$1 billion per year if they fully integrated their supply chains. West Michigan's worldwide office furniture suppliers, Steelcase, Herman Miller, and Haworth, are facing significant challenges both as a result of the economic downturn and stiff foreign competition. Information technology is a powerful tool for bringing together the various elements of design, manufacturing, and delivery of furniture, and the U.S. furniture industry is beginning to utilize this tool to better integrate these elements.

□ 1215

All three firms, and others, can realize huge benefits through better linkage with their suppliers, which will lead to reductions in inventory, fewer manufacturing slow downs, lower purchasing costs, and higher quality.

Achieving this level of integration, however, is complex and requires a substantial amount of research regarding what information exchange standards need to be developed and implemented for different supply changes. H.R. 2733

will allow NIST to capitalize on its existing knowledge in this field by authorizing the agency to work with major manufacturing sectors, such as automotive, aerospace, electronics, shipbuilding, and furniture, to reach a consensus on what standards are needed to integrate supply chains, support the development of those standards, and help smaller businesses in those industries integrate fully into their respective supply chain.

Under this legislation, NIST will work with major manufacturing industries to identify current enterprise integration standardization and implementation activities within the United States and abroad and assess the current state of these activities within any given industry.

NIST will also work with individual industries to develop goals and milestones for fully integrating the industry's supply chains. Additionally, NIST will support the development, testing, promulgation, integration, adoption and upgrading of standards related to enterprise integration efforts.

I want to note that this legislation has strong bipartisan and industry support. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and I have introduced this legislation, and we have worked together every step of the way as it moved to the House floor. The legislation also unanimously passed the Committee on Science. In addition, industry groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Coalition for Advanced Manufacturing support the legislation.

If our manufacturing sector is to remain competitive in the global marketplace, and if it is going to continue to provide jobs for American workers, it must undertake the efforts envisioned by this legislation. I urge Members to support the Enterprise Integration Act so we can meet this goal.

Let me also comment to explain this in a very simple fashion, using the words that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) used earlier during discussion on the rule, and that is if we do not talk the same language with each other, we cannot communicate and we cannot get the job done. The whole purpose of this bill is to ensure that the computers and the officials of the companies involved can talk the same language using the Internet, and that through that common language the whole system will work much more efficiently, the manufacturers will benefit through increased profits, the workers of the companies will benefit through higher pay and more jobs. This is a good bill, and I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002. I rise to commend the gentleman from

Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for his vision in creating this legislation, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for their efforts in moving this bill through the legislative process.

Manufacturing has been and must continue to be one of the pillars of the American economy. Federal Government support for U.S. small businesses engaged in manufacturing is not a new thing. It dates way back to the early days of our century when Alexander Hamilton led efforts to help United States manufacturers adjust to the industrial revolution. We understood even then, while we are first and foremost a Nation of free enterprise, that free enterprise works best when our manufacturers are equipped to compete on a level playing field and acceptable to American industry.

As H.R. 2733 clearly points out, we have entered a period that could be just as wrenching to today's manufacturers as the industrial revolution was to Alexander Hamilton's contemporaries. Even a decade ago, it was still possible to think of small manufacturers as independent businessmen and women who made products for consumers and other companies. Now the business environment is changing rapidly, with the advent of the Internet and business-to-business software. Companies which cannot function as close partners of other companies at every step of the manufacturing process risk being left behind.

Products are now designed in weeks rather than in months. Products become out of date in months rather than years. Suppliers now deliver what they call "just in time." In this new time frame, all waste time must be squeezed from the manufacturing process. Manufacturers and their suppliers must design products together. They must exchange manufacturing data electronically. The day when virtual manufacturing arrives and it becomes difficult to tell where one company ends and its suppliers begin seems just around the corner. Our job is to ensure we, the government, do not force them offshore like they have done to the chemical companies in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I just comment that both software and standards that are driving this process, advanced software that knows everything happening on a factory floor, are becoming more and more common; and as new Internet software will soon make it possible to transmit three-dimensional data anywhere in the world, this is helpful only if the receiving computer system can understand and use what is sent. Unfortunately, the millions of legacy computer systems are more like an electronic Tower of Babel than a seamless communication system.

This will change. Work on product data exchange international standards that will now solve this problem is ongoing in Europe as well as in the

United States. However, the European Union is investing much more money and much more heavily than in the United States. It is funding product data exchange standards, industry by industry, from autos and aerospace to textiles and furniture. If we do not match these efforts, we run the risk of an international standard being promulgated that favors European manufacturers over our own.

I am pleased that the bill is supported by the trade associations for several of these manufacturing sectors, as well as the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Coalition for Advanced Manufacturing.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to let our small businesses fall behind as the world moves toward Internet-based manufacturing. I urge Members to support America's smaller manufacturers, and their larger partners as well, by voting for H.R. 2733.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Enterprise Integration Act. This bill authorizes the National Institute of Standards and Technology to promote best practice standards and facilitate understanding between industry and government.

Approximately 90 percent of U.S. manufacturing companies are small and medium-sized businesses. Quick and easy access to information in the supply chain is critical for small businesses to be competitive. Suppliers without the capability to collect and exchange data electronically run the risk of being replaced by other suppliers who can.

The last decade has seen a dramatic shift in the way information and data are exchanged. This is due to the emergence of the Internet and the movement toward electronically integrated supply chains.

Enterprise integration permits a group of manufacturers and suppliers to operate as a single virtual company, without time delays and data loss or corruption. Manufacturers must be flexible, efficient, and responsive to changes in customer preference.

NIST will work with industry and small business to improve the way they share product and standard information. With over 20 years of experience in data integration, NIST has the experience to accelerate efforts to develop industry standards and integration techniques that are necessary to increase efficiency and lower costs. Connecting enterprise together will streamline the manufacturing process, break down communication barriers, improve knowledge sharing, and connect information systems.

In my home State of Michigan, small businesses are vital to the State economy. Over 45 percent of Michigan small businesses are in the manufacturing sector and enterprise integration is extremely important to ensure that the

manufacturing industry in Michigan and around the Nation remain strong.

The investment in enterprise integration is essential for U.S. industry to remain competitive with overseas companies, many of which are already heavily investing in electronic standards development.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for developing this important legislation and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) of the Committee on Science for bringing this to the floor. I appreciate their hard work on behalf of the small business community, and I urge Members to join me in supporting the Enterprise Integration Act.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), the creator of this legislation.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2733, the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002; and I thank the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for recognizing the importance of this bill and taking the steps necessary for this bill to be considered here today. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the subcommittee chairman and lead cosponsor, for the gentleman's efforts over the past year. His suggested changes have enhanced the legislation, and his legislative efforts have contributed significantly to the progress we have made on this legislation.

I just want to take a couple of minutes to outline the need and purpose of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002 and say I appreciate the comments of my colleagues who have spoken before me on the need for this legislation to become law, to not only help small and medium-sized businesses throughout the Midwest, but across the country. And also to say that as impressive as the growth of Internet companies has been, its impact pales in significance to the impact that the Internet is having on how businesses work together. Changes already under way in the manufacturing sector will permit a manufacturer and its suppliers to function as one virtual company. Companies will be able to exchange information of all types with their suppliers at the speed of light.

This will dramatically shorten design-cycle times and reduce the costs of manufacturing complex products. Information on design flaws will be instantly transmitted from repair shops to manufacturers and their supply chains.

However, to exchange this information, each company's computers have to speak the same language. Sometimes the document can be converted, other times someone has to reenter the information. The problems get much more severe when the information being exchanged is three-dimensional engineering drawings or complex data

from the manufacturing process. How companies address this basic question of data exchange will determine how quickly enterprise integration occurs in the United States.

This legislation tasks the National Institute of Standards and Technology to help nine key industries stay competitive in the electronic enterprise age, if those industries want the help. The legislation instructs the director of NIST, through various NIST programs, to support the auto, aerospace, furniture, shipbuilding, textile, apparel, electronics, home building, and major construction industries in the establishment of an industry-led effort on enterprise integration. If an industry has not yet begun an effort, NIST would be asked to help convene companies and trade associations in the industry to develop a strategy for developing and implementing a unified vision for supply chain integration.

If efforts are already under way and the industry wants NIST's help, NIST is to support the ongoing efforts. NIST is asked to look at the suite of standards now in place and to help fill the holes such as compatibility of older standards with emerging Internet standards.

With the continued assistance of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), I am hopeful that this legislation will become the catalyst to allow American businesses to successfully compete with our European counterparts.

The bill authorizes appropriations of \$10 million for fiscal year 2003 and \$15 million for fiscal year 2004, and \$20 million in fiscal year 2005.

Enterprise integration has the potential to be the most important innovation in manufacturing since Henry Ford's assembly line. I urge a "yes" vote on this bill because H.R. 2733 will give U.S. industry the opportunity to be a leader in this innovation.

□ 1230

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my next speaker, the gentlewoman from Maryland, had to leave for the Committee on Government Reform to present an amendment there. I particularly regret it because she is such an outstanding Member of Congress and an extremely conscientious member of the committee and has worked very hard on this bill. But her comments will be entered into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to at this time thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for his work on this bill and his work on the Committee on Science. He has been an outstanding ranking member to work with on this subcommittee and we have accomplished a great deal this year by sharing ideas and working together on bills.

I have shared a legislative career with the gentleman from Michigan

(Mr. BARCIA) longer than most people in this Congress have. We served together in the State House of Michigan and the State Senate of Michigan. He preceded me to this Congress by 11 months and 7 days, but we have worked together since then in this Congress.

I am very sorry to see him leave this Congress, even though he will be returning to the State of Michigan and will continue to make his contributions there. But it has been an outstanding partnership on this committee. We have produced some really good work together with a minimum of strife because both of us are interested in results and not in seeking partisan advantage on an issue. I just want to publicly state how much I have enjoyed working with the gentleman, how much I appreciate his work and his person and his ethical standards, and just state my regret that he will be leaving us at the end of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS), a member of our committee.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002. This bill directs the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to establish a program to help major manufacturing industries, especially small businesses, standardize and better integrate exchange of data between manufacturers, assemblers and suppliers.

H.R. 2733 is a timely and smart piece of legislation. Small manufacturers are the backbone of our economy. However, they do not operate in a vacuum. Manufacturers, large and small, work together along a vertical supply chain, making a seamless flow of information critical to their success.

Currently, many small businesses do not have the knowledge or ability to access the type of electronic media large manufacturers use to integrate purchases. In other cases, compatibility issues between different computer networks, software and hardware make it difficult, and sometimes impossible, for the full benefits of virtual manufacturing environments to be realized.

This lack of compatibility in computer hardware, software and their interfaces with machinery makes it difficult for these supply chain firms to supply the goods and services to their traditional clients in an efficient manner, and makes it even harder to develop relationships with new clients.

As we move forward into an international economy, our domestic producers must be able to keep up with suppliers and manufacturers overseas. The European Union is already investing substantially in ensuring that its companies will be able to perform in the emerging virtual business environment, where the Internet will permit companies anywhere in the world to exchange data and function as a single virtual company.

H.R. 2733 addresses this need and establishes an enterprise integration initiative at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. This will allow NIST to work with industry to develop road maps that outline the steps a given industry must take to become more integrated electronically and also help industry develop volunteer consensus standards and agreements on protocols for information exchange which will provide assistance to conduct pilot projects to support the initiative.

The Enterprise Integration Act of 2002 takes the necessary steps to get standards in place to create the first truly virtual companies. When industries become fully integrated electronically, information can flow freely along the entire supply chain without corruption or loss of important data. All types of manufacturers, from automobiles to furniture to shipbuilding, will stand to benefit from the efficiency gains that this legislation will help usher in. I stand in support of this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude by saying that this is a very worthwhile bill which, even though I gave all the examples as benefiting Michigan industry, it will benefit the industry of every State in this Union, and, for that matter, every territory. It is a good thing for us to do, to help create more jobs and to make sure that we are more competitive in the world marketplace. I urge passage of this bill.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I rise in support of H.R. 2733, the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002. I want to commend Chairman EHLERS and Ranking Member BARCIA for their bipartisan efforts in bringing this bill before us today.

Enterprise integration is quickly becoming one of the most important business concepts of the electronic age. Developing a seamless exchange of information along a vertical supply chain is essential to maintaining production in our new, fast-paced, just-in-time-manufacturing economy. Companies are increasingly interconnected and must rely on one another in ways never before imagined. Standardization of their means of communication is imperative for their continued success.

Enterprise integration allows a group of businesses to act as a single "virtual" company. Design or management changes are immediately transmitted throughout the supply chain, allowing real time integration into the various components. The result is a leaner and more efficient manufacturing process. Implementation of such a plan has been projected to save the auto industry over \$1 billion/year. Similarly dramatic savings are possible in a host of other manufacturing industries as well. Any industry that relies on a series of companies efficiently working together would benefit.

However, there are significant challenges. Significant numbers of incompatible design, engineering and manufacturing systems

abound within a typical supply chain. Various vendors have been selling management systems to individual companies for years without incorporating concern for future interconnectivity. Even new development causes problems. New software packages with greater functionality create difficulties for small companies at the bottom of the supply chain, since they can ill-afford to keep up with the latest technology.

One promising solution is in data exchange standards. The creation of standard protocols for the exchange of information between systems could alleviate the difficulties associated with inter-company communication. NIST has over 20 years experience in this critical area and is well positioned to take the lead for enterprising integration in the United States. NIST has a long track record and a close and trusted relationship among industry leaders. It has obtained this reputation by working with industry and including them in the standards setting process rather than imposing one on them. In addition, NIST already has a number of programs designed at improving the role of small businesses and is aware of their particular needs.

Standards are essential to enterprise integration and traditionally it has been the role of government to foster their development. NIST has all of the expertise and experience required and is the ideal agency to lead this effort. I want to thank the leadership for recognizing the importance of this issue to the small business community and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in a nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of Section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Enterprise Integration Act of 2002".

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Over 90 percent of United States companies engaged in manufacturing are small and medium-sized businesses.

(2) Most of these manufacturers produce goods for assemblage into products of large companies.

(3) The emergence of the World Wide Web and the promulgation of international standards for

product data exchange greatly accelerated the movement toward electronically integrated supply chains during the last half of the 1990's.

(4) European and Asian countries are investing heavily in electronic enterprise standards development, and in preparing their smaller manufacturers to do business in the new environment. European efforts are well advanced in the aerospace, automotive, and shipbuilding industries and are beginning in other industries including home building, furniture manufacturing, textiles, and apparel. This investment could give overseas companies a major competitive advantage.

(5) The National Institute of Standards and Technology, because of the electronic commerce expertise in its laboratories and quality program, its long history of working cooperatively with manufacturers, and the nationwide reach of its manufacturing extension program, is in a unique position to help United States large and smaller manufacturers alike in their responses to this challenge.

(6) It is, therefore, in the national interest for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to accelerate its efforts in helping industry develop standards and enterprise integration processes that are necessary to increase efficiency and lower costs.

SEC. 3. ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish an initiative for advancing enterprise integration within the United States. In carrying out this section, the Director shall involve, as appropriate, the various units of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology laboratories (including the Building and Fire Research Laboratory), the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program established under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l), and the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Program. This initiative shall build upon ongoing efforts of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and of the private sector, shall involve consortia that include government and industry, and shall address the enterprise integration needs of each United States major manufacturing industry at the earliest possible date.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—For each major manufacturing industry, the Director may work with industry, trade associations, professional societies, and others as appropriate, to identify enterprise integration standardization and implementation activities underway in the United States and abroad that affect that industry and to assess the current state of enterprise integration within that industry. The Director may assist in the development of roadmaps to permit supply chains within the industry to operate as an integrated electronic enterprise. The roadmaps shall be based on voluntary consensus standards.

(c) REPORTS.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the National Institute of Standards and Technology's activities under subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In order to carry out this Act, the Director may work with industry, trade associations, professional societies, and others as appropriate—

(1) to raise awareness in the United States of enterprise integration activities in the United States and abroad, including by the convening of conferences;

(2) on the development of enterprise integration roadmaps;

(3) to support the development, testing, promulgation, integration, adoption, and upgrading of standards related to enterprise integration including application protocols; and

(4) to provide technical assistance and, if necessary, financial support to small and medium-sized businesses that set up pilot projects in enterprise integration.

(e) **MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PROGRAM.**—The Director shall ensure that the Manufacturing Extension Program is prepared to advise small and medium-sized businesses on how to acquire the expertise, equipment, and training necessary to participate fully in supply chains using enterprise integration.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term “automotive” means land-based engine-powered vehicles including automobiles, trucks, busses, trains, defense vehicles, farm equipment, and motorcycles;

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(3) the term “enterprise integration” means the electronic linkage of manufacturers, assemblers, suppliers, and customers to enable the electronic exchange of product, manufacturing, and other business data among all partners in a product supply chain, and such term includes related application protocols and other related standards;

(4) the term “major manufacturing industry” includes the aerospace, automotive, electronics, shipbuilding, construction, home building, furniture, textile, and apparel industries and such other industries as the Director designates; and

(5) the term “roadmap” means an assessment of manufacturing interoperability requirements developed by an industry describing that industry’s goals related to enterprise integration, the knowledge and standards including application protocols necessary to achieve those goals, and the necessary steps, timetable, and assignment of responsibilities for acquiring the knowledge and developing the standards and protocols.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director to carry out functions under this Act—

(1) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(2) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(3) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

(4) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 5, line 6, insert “, including awareness by businesses that are majority owned by women, minorities, or both,” after “in the United States”.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. As a Member of the House Committee on Science, I remember having the pleasure of joining this committee when I first was elected and I started out by saying science is the work of the 21st century. This legislation epitomizes that thought.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for his long-standing leadership on this issue to recognize that it is our job in this Congress to help create jobs and to make a better pathway for those jobs to be created and for the products to be the best product that you can produce here in the United States. This legislation does that. I do thank him for that.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) again for his leader-

ship and the bipartisan spirit that this legislation has moved, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the committee, for putting forward H.R. 2733, the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002.

I believe that this country loses when we lose the opportunity to manufacture. We lose the opportunity to have that kind of technology and expertise, because I agree with the chairman of this subcommittee and, of course, the ranking member, that computers are very important in allowing their language to be the same. We speak now in computers. We use computers almost for everything that we can think of. We use it in our consumer life and in our nonbusiness life, but we certainly do use it in our business life, and it is important for computers of all companies, of all size companies, to be able to communicate. That means that the language must be the same, the whole system must be integrated and they must understand each other.

I believe that manufacturers in the United States will benefit, and I have a particular area in my district where there are small manufacturers and small businesses, and they depend upon producing a product that large manufacturers will buy. They need to have the right language to produce the safest and best product. I believe the workers will benefit because that small company will benefit, and, as well, I believe that we will have a better and more diverse product.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I am now submitting this amendment, as I said, in order to ensure that our women-owned and minority-owned businesses are likewise involved; that they have the same outreach, the same capacity, the same language, the same computer technology.

We said some few years ago, and it seems like it was a long time ago, that we must close the digital divide. The Committee on Science has worked diligently with many members of the Committee on Science to make sure the digital divide is closed and our schools are linked, our small businesses are linked, our communities are linked.

I might say there is work to be done in our rural areas and our urban areas and some of the schools across the Nation, I would say a large number. This is a step in the direction of ensuring that the manufacturing system, large and small, is integrated together. I know the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) has worked very long on this, and again I would like to say this is where Texas and Michigan are working together, because even though we are in different regions, we know that automation, technology and manufacturing speak in one voice and one language.

I would like to make sure that when we talk about these issues, we talk about the richness of the diversity of America and all businesses, small busi-

nesses, minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses, have the ability to access H.R. 2733.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, from the dawn of the computer age, integrated automation has been the Holy Grail of computing. Achieving full integrated automation remains elusive, despite huge investments in a wide array of technologies that promise integration—from database technologies to single-vendor application suites. The integration challenge is fundamentally twofold: (1) business process assets (programs and documentation) and (2) information assets (databases and files). A complete enterprise integration strategy must encompass both of these critically important asset classes.

The guiding philosophy behind integration at the data layer is that the real currency of the enterprise is its data and that the best path to this data is usually not through the original application. Additionally, the implied business logic in the data and metadata can be easily manipulated directly by applications in the new architecture of the enterprise. This premise is underscored by the fact that in both application integration and data integration, business logic is transferred and/or rewritten outside the original applications. The challenge is in actually getting to the data. Current business processes are critical to initiatives focused on the improved automation of internal workflow as well as interactions with suppliers, partners and distributors. Reusing the existing application packages is reasonable, because the focus is on improving the delivery mechanism or extending the system-level interfaces of the current processes. Data asset integration is critical to the success of externally focused initiatives that are driven by new business processes. For example, self-service initiatives are driven by the needs of new audiences to access existing information.

Today’s U.S. economy depends more than ever on the talents of skilled, high-tech workers. To sustain America’s preeminence we must take drastic steps to change the way we develop our technology landscape. The continually evolving nature of every business’s application landscape drives the need for easy-to-use automated information integration between application platforms. While the ideal is a single database infrastructure that supports all applications within a business, the evolutionary nature of technology investments makes this an unattainable goal for most.

To address these challenges, companies are devising integration architectures designed to leverage their data assets while insulating themselves from ongoing changes in technology. Unfortunately, there is no single strategy or product that addresses all the diverse integration challenges faced by most enterprises. Therefore, enterprise integration is not a one-size-fits-all problem, and there is no one-size-fits-all solution. The businesses need that drive to search for integration solutions that demand a mix of technologies. Understanding the dynamics of application-driven and data-driven integration solutions empowers technology to implement the right solution for the problem at hand.

By not tapping into the potential of all our groups, we are losing ground by not tapping into the potential of all our groups. We must take some bold steps today, for the rewards to

our country and our citizens will be great. Many minority people feel it's an impossible field to get into because they have had little or no knowledge about career choices in the field.

Changes are sweeping our computer-inter-twined real lives in many different directions and our society is being further fragmented, not only by levels of education, financial status, and ethnic background, but also by accessibility to and knowledge of the world of the artificial. The world of interactions with computers has extended from programming to dialogs and navigation in virtual and simulated worlds of information that will further divide our children and adults into "haves and have-nots." The underrepresented minority population in the United States, while increasing in numbers, is decreasing in numbers of people entering the computer field at a time when the bounty of new opportunities seems to be rising without end in sight. Large segments of the population, on the basis of ethnicity and gender, are not participating in proportional numbers in supplying the information technology needs of the nation.

The lack of diversity of science, engineering and technology education and careers is nothing new. Stereotypes based on race, ethnicity, gender, and disability have long discouraged inquisitive minds whose bodies do not match the public image. This is why I have proposed these amendments, I believe that women and minorities should be included in this technology revolution. They should not be left behind.

I urge support of the amendments to H.R. 2733.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to rise and indicate my willingness to accept this amendment, just as we did in the previous bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked with the gentlewoman from Texas on many issues relating to this. I am very familiar with NIST and their work, and, I suspect, in fact, I believe it is correct to say that they are as color-blind and gender-blind as anyone I have known, largely because on issues such as this they are working primarily on the computer language rather than on other issues.

But, nevertheless, given the past history of our Nation and of some business practices, it never hurts to add the language that the gentlewoman from Texas has included in her amendment, and it certainly enhances the bill, does not detract from it, and I am very pleased to accept this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman very much as well, because we have worked on the Committee on Science for a number of years and I believe he has consistently joined in on issues dealing with outreach to minorities and women. I thank the gentleman for accepting this particular amendment that adds to this very excellent bill on this issue.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas. It is an upgrading amendment. It is in the area of a housekeeping amendment, but it is much more than that.

This amendment actually accentuates awareness, delineates the requirement that all sectors are addressed. The gentlewoman included all businesses, including women and minorities. It is a good amendment. It certainly helps to close the digital divide, and I support the amendment and ask for its passage.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her amendment, which strengthens the bill and sends the right signal that we all recognize here in Congress and across the country that the major growth of small- and medium-sized businesses in this country is at the behest of women entrepreneurs, as well as minority entrepreneurs. Certainly it is the intent of this legislation to include all of those risk-takers who create jobs and create growth in our economy. Obviously I think the bill is a better bill with the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I am fully supportive of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman EHLERS) for his kind remarks and say that I have enjoyed serving on our subcommittee thoroughly with each and every member of that subcommittee who worked so diligently and in a bipartisan fashion each and every week throughout the year we are in session to produce a great quality of legislation and measures that will enhance competitiveness for our domestic business community, as well as strengthen science in business and our environmental regulations.

I am proud as a member of that subcommittee to say that we always approached these issues with a bipartisan approach, and I am very grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the members of the subcommittee and the full committee, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), for moving this legislation so expeditiously.

□ 1245

It will help, and I am grateful for their support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 5, after line 25, insert the following new subsection:

(f) WOMEN AND MINORITY AWARENESS STUDIES.—

(1) BASELINE STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report describing the extent of awareness of, and participation in, enterprise integration development activities by businesses that are majority owned by women, minorities, or both.

(2) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report evaluating the extent to which activities under this section, especially under subsection (d)(1), have increased the awareness of, and participation in, enterprise integration development activities by businesses that are majority owned by women, minorities, or both.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me frame my interest in this amendment, and that is that I believe to sustain America's preeminence we must take drastic steps to change the way we develop our technology landscape. The continually evolving nature of every business's application landscape drives the need for easy-to-use automated immigration between application platforms.

This is an excellent legislative initiative that we are now discussing. And I wanted to make sure that as we implemented this legislation, I encourage my colleagues to vote enthusiastically for H.R. 2733, that we would put in place a women-and-minority awareness study to ensure that we are reaching out to women-owned businesses as we do to all businesses and to minority businesses all over this country.

But I have had the opportunity to discuss with the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), and I am very pleased with both the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and his commitment to this issue, and I would like to work with them with the idea of working this legislation through its process as it works its will to ensure that these aspects of the legislation are included, and we will work together on that. And in that vein, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BARCIA. I would like to thank the gentlewoman for withdrawing this amendment, but also pledge my support in work with her and other members of the subcommittee and Chairman EHLERS, as well as those officials at NIST, to accomplish the goals of this amendment, and I appreciate again the intent of what she is trying

to accomplish. It certainly will enhance the mission that we are attempting to achieve with this bill, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for the amendment which was just adopted which strengthens the bill, but also agreeing today to work further on this issue as the process moves forward.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank very much the distinguished ranking member. We are going to miss him very much as he goes on to other great opportunities in his great State, and we appreciate very much his leadership on this issue.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for offering the amendment that once again raises an issue that deserves to be raised. But I also appreciate her withdrawing this because it would be inappropriate in this bill at this time simply because it would likely detract from the central goal and slow it down, and it is very important to get this into action soon. But once again, this is something we would pursue down the line, I am sure, if there is a problem that has to be followed. So I appreciate her offering it, and I appreciate her willingness to withdraw it at this time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Michigan on this.

Mr. Chairman, with the acknowledgment of the great work of our respective ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) on this matter, I look forward to working with them on this. More importantly, I am delighted that this legislation will bear the gentleman's name and so many lives will be improved by this legislation. Mr. Chairman, with that I will work on this matter with my colleagues.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substituted, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2733) to authorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology

to work with major manufacturing industries on an initiative of standards development and implementation for electronic enterprise integration, pursuant to House Resolution 474, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that this vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of H.R. 2486.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 22, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Arney
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)

Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette

Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor

Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender
MoDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen

Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shaays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Akin
Burton
Coble
Cubin
Culberson
Duncan

Flake
Hefley
Hostettler
Kerns
Miller, Jeff
Otter

Paul
Pence
Rohrabacher
Royce

Ryun (KS) Sensenbrenner Tancred
Schaffer Stearns Toomey

NOT VOTING—15

Barrett Dunn Reyes
Becerra Goodlatte Roukema
Blagojevich Hastings (FL) Traficant
Bonior Lewis (GA) Velazquez
Collins Meehan Watkins (OK)

□ 1314

Messrs. DUNCAN, SCHAFFER, HEFLEY, AKIN, BURTON, and ROHR-ABACHER and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INLAND FORECASTING IMPROVEMENT AND WARNING SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of the passage of the bill, H.R. 2486, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie Cannon Doyle
Ackerman Cantor Dreier
Aderholt Capito Duncan
Akin Capps Edwards
Allen Capuano Ehlers
Andrews Cardin Ehrlich
Armey Carson (IN) Emerson
Baca Carson (OK) Engel
Bachus Castle English
Baird Chabot Eshoo
Baker Chambliss Etheridge
Baldwin Clay Everett
Ballenger Clayton Farr
Barcia Clement Fattah
Barr Clyburn Ferguson
Bartlett Coble Filner
Barton Combest Fletcher
Bass Condit Foley
Becerra Conyers Forbes
Bentsen Cooksey Ford
Bereuter Costello Fossella
Berkley Coyne Frank
Berman Cramer Frelinghuysen
Berry Crane Frost
Biggart Crenshaw Gallegly
Billirakis Crowley Ganske
Bishop Cubin Gekas
Blumenauer Culberson Gephardt
Blunt Cummings Gibbons
Boehlert Cunningham Gilchrest
Boehner Davis (CA) Gillmor
Bonilla Davis (FL) Gilman
Bono Davis (IL) Gonzalez
Boozman Davis, Jo Ann Goode
Borski Davis, Tom Gordon
Boswell Deal Goss
Boucher DeFazio Graham
Boyd DeGette Granger
Brady (PA) Delahunt Graves
Brady (TX) DeLauro Green (TX)
Brown (FL) DeLay Green (WI)
Brown (OH) DeMint Greenwood
Brown (SC) Deutsch Grucci
Bryant Diaz-Balart Gutierrez
Burr Dicks Gutknecht
Buyer Dingell Hall (OH)
Callahan Doggett Hall (TX)
Calvert Dooley Hansen
Camp Doolittle Harman

Hart Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth Hefley
Herger Hill
Hilleary Hilliard
Hinchey Hinojosa
Hobson Hoeft
Hoekstra Holden
Holt Miller, Dan
Honda Miller, Gary
Hooley Miller, Jeff
Horn Mink
Hostettler Molohan
Houghton Moore
Hoyer Moran (KS)
Hulshof Moran (VA)
Hunter Morella
Hyde Murtha
Inslee Myrick
Isakson Nadler
Israel Napolitano
Issa Neal
Istook Nethercutt
Jackson (IL) Ney
Jackson-Lee Northup
(TX) Norwood
Jefferson Nussle
Jenkins Oberstar
John Obey
Johnson (CT) Oliver
Johnson (IL) Ortiz
Johnson, E. B. Ose
Johnson, Sam Otter
Jones (NC) Owens
Jones (OH) Oxley
Kanjorski Pallone
Kaptur Pascrell
Keller Pastor
Kelly Paul
Kennedy (MN) Payne
Kennedy (RI) Pelosi
Kildee Pence
Kilpatrick Peterson (MN)
Kind (WI) Peterson (PA)
King (NY) Petri
Kingston Phelps
Kirk Pickering
Kleczka Pitts
Knollenberg Platts
Kolbe Pombo
Kucinich Pomeroy
LaFalce Portman
LaHood Price (NC)
Lampson Pryce (OH)
Langevin Putnam
Lantos Quinn
Larsen (WA) Radanovich
Larsen (CT) Rahall
Latham Ramstad
LaTourette Rangel
Leach Regula
Lee Rehberg
Levin Reyes
Lewis (CA) Reynolds
Lewis (KY) Riley
Linder Rivers
Lipinski Rodriguez
LoBiondo Roemer
Lofgren Rogers (KY)
Lucas (KY) Rogers (MI)
Lucas (OK) Rohrabacher
Luther Ros-Lehtinen
Lynch Ross
Maloney (CT) Rothman
Maloney (NY) Roybal-Allard
Manzullo Royce
Markey Rush
Mascara Ryan (WI)
Matheson Ryun (KS)
Matsui Sabo
McCarthy (MO) Sanchez
McCarthy (NY) Sanders
McCollum Sandlin

NAYS—3

Flake Kerns Sensenbrenner
Baldacci Burton Evans
Barrett Collins Goodlatte
Blagojevich Cox Hastings (FL)
Bonior Dunn Lewis (GA)

NOT VOTING—18

Lowey Miller, George Roukema
Meehan Osborne Traficant

□ 1322

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through the United States Weather Research Program, to conduct research and development, training, and outreach activities relating to inland flood forecasting improvement, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, on the last recorded vote, I was unable to get to the recorded vote. I would have voted "yea" if I had an opportunity to do that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2002, I was unable to be present for roll-call votes No. 293 and No. 294.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 293, in favor of H.R. 2733, the Enterprise Integration Act of 2002, and "yea" on rollcall No. 294, in favor of H.R. 2486, the Tropical Cyclone Inland Forecasting Improvement and Warning System Development Act of 2002.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable EDOLPHUS TOWNS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 1, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM WASHINGTON OPERATIONS DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF HON. TOM LATHAM, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from James D. Carstensen, Washington Operations Director, Office of the Honorable TOM LATHAM, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

JAMES D. CARSTENSEN,
Washington Operations Director, Office of Congressman Tom Latham (IA-05).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2733.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RECONSTRUCTIVE SURGERY ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to share with my colleagues the heartbreaking story of a constituent of mine. After hearing of the challenges she has faced and still faces today in order to try and live a normal life, I introduced the Reconstructive Surgery Act of 2002, H.R. 4959.

This bill requires health insurance plans to cover medically necessary reconstructive surgery for congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, infection, trauma or disease.

As an infant, Wendelyn Osborne was diagnosed with a rare, congenital bone disease, craniometaphysial dysplasia, or CMD, which involves an overgrowth of facial bone that never deteriorates.

At the time of her diagnosis, she was the sixteenth CMD case in the world in medical history. Doctors told her parents that she would not live past the age of 10. After many surgeries, starting at the age of 6, Wendelyn has lived to be 36 years old. But she is not free of the harmful effects of her disease. Her facial muscles are paralyzed. Her optic nerve is damaged, and she must wear a hearing aid in order to hear properly. The severity of her abnormalities re-

quires further orthognathic surgeries so she may continue to be able to eat properly. Yet, Mrs. Osborne's insurance company will not cover this procedure because it is considered cosmetic.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) as a cosponsor on this legislation with me. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from the Fourth District of Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) for his leadership on this matter. Clearly, the bill that he has introduced and I cosponsored, H.R. 4959, that requires health insurance to cover medically necessary reconstructive surgery for congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma or disease is the right thing to do.

□ 1330

People that are so unfortunate that they would be faced with a situation like this and desperately need insurance coverage should be respected by the insurance companies that choose to take advantage of a situation and refuse to pay for the care that these people need.

My colleague from the 4th District has already referred to Ms. Osborne, an Arkansas resident who was diagnosed with a rare, life-threatening congenital bone disease as a child. This should not be something that the insurance companies are allowed to take advantage of. It is time that this House does the right thing. It is time that we make it possible for Ms. Osborne and others that have been unfortunate enough to need this kind of treatment, that they will be allowed and that they will have the opportunity and that the insurance companies will provide the necessary coverage for their treatment.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) for joining me here today in our fight in trying to correct the wrong by the big insurance companies.

They covered the surgeries that Wendelyn needed until she was about 18, maybe 21. Then it is like they are saying she was not supposed to live this long so we will not cover her operations any more. That is wrong.

The Reconstructive Surgery Act that we have written defines medically necessary reconstructive surgery as surgery performed to correct or repair abnormal structures of the body caused by congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma, infection, tumors or disease. The surgery must be designed to improve functions or to give the patient a normal appearance to the extent possible in the judgment of the physician performing the surgery.

It specifically excludes cosmetic procedures defined as surgery that is performed to alter or reshape the normal structures of the body in order to improve appearance.

This bill draws a line between improving looks and improving life, oftentimes, as in Wendelyn's case, per-

haps saving a life. Several States have a law requiring insurance coverage of medically necessary reconstructive surgery up to the age of 18. The Reconstructive Surgery Act is an effort to build upon what the States have started as well as address the apparent arbitrary decision-making of some big insurance plans that refuse coverage and question physicians' judgments when patients like Wendelyn Osborne try to get coverage under the plan for which they pay premiums every month.

The Reconstructive Surgery Act is endorsed by the National Organization for Rare Disorders, National Foundation for Facial Reconstruction, Easter Seals and the March of Dimes.

I am going to fight to move this legislation forward, to help people like Wendelyn Osborne get the reconstructive surgeries that they must have to stay alive and to live as normal and healthy a life as possible, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this fight.

According to one Harvard researcher, there have been CMD sufferers in their 50's and 60's who continue to need surgery to prevent conditions such as this, procedures that will allow them to continue eating and breathing, yet orthognathic surgery is considered cosmetic.

Many of you remember the movie "Mask" in which Cher played the mother of a boy named Rocky who died from a disease similar to CMD. That movie was based on a true story. Rocky died because his mother couldn't afford the life-saving reconstructive surgeries he needed.

Ms. Osborne has never met another person who suffers from CMD, but she has met countless people who struggle with trying to get the reconstructive surgeries they need. People born with cleft lips and palates, with missing pectoral muscles that cause chest deformities, even burn victims—all cases where reconstructive surgery is considered merely cosmetic.

For these people, falling into the wrong category means denial of coverage for their medical needs.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4600

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President gave a stunning speech the other day and talked about corporate responsibility. This is the new face of corporate responsibility, the chief law enforcement officer of the Securities and Exchange Commission. His name is Harvey Pitt. He is a former lobbyist for securities firms and accounting firms, and as a lobbyist, he opposed all reforms and tightening of regulations.

He was not there at the President's speech and some would say, well, the President's trying to kind of hide this guy because he is an embarrassment. Well, no, despite the fact that some of us think there is a crisis in corporate ethics and the meltdown and the bankruptcies and the pension losses and the tanking of the stock market and all the basic outright thievery that was going on, he was at the beach on vacation, but it really does not matter much because Harvey Pitt is so conflicted he cannot vote as the chief law enforcement officer of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

They were recently undertaking an enforcement action against an accounting firm. There were three commissioners present. They heard the evidence of the staff. It was compelling. They wanted to prosecute that firm, but Mr. Pitt had to say, oh, excuse me, they are my former clients, I represent them, I cannot vote. The other woman commissioner there said, gee, actually, I represented them, too; I cannot vote. So there was one commissioner left who could vote, a Clinton appointee, who did not have a conflict of interest. He voted to prosecute them, but then they appealed to an administrative law judge and said, hey, you cannot convict us with one vote, and in fact, the administrative law judge said you are right.

So here we have the new push for corporate accountability and responsibility, and we have a Securities and Exchange Commission that cannot prosecute anybody because two of the three sitting members named by President Bush are so conflicted because these are their former clients and their future clients when they leave their so-called public service they cannot vote.

So this is wonderful. We can talk about getting tough, but nobody is going to be prosecuted, fined or go to jail. It is a very interesting sort of turn of events.

Mr. Pitt has had and said some pretty interesting things. Here is his philosophy as the chief law enforcement officer of the Securities and Exchange Commission. In general, Mr. Pitt said in November, My preferred approach to any regulatory issue is one in which the government's participation is as limited as reasonably possible.

Well, he is at the beach and he cannot vote so I guess he is following his own provisos here.

Then we have his other famous statement when he was first sworn in. He went up to his buddies on Wall Street, had lunch, had a great time, lot of

champagne and stuff. They are celebrating his becoming their regulator because they knew they would not have to worry much, and he said and promised, "a kinder and gentler place for accountants." The crooks could come to Harvey, share lunch, and it would be a kinder and gentler SEC.

If my colleagues saw the President's speech, there was this wonderful back-drop. Corporate responsibility, it said time and time and time again so one would not miss the message, even though, of course, the President was not advocating anything new or anything stringent or anything that might really jeopardize any of his corporate friends and contributors. Actually, what most people in the public do not know is actually that was the punishment. There was already very stiff punishment levied on those Wall Street tycoons. They had had to write 1,000 times on the wall "corporate responsibility" before the President's speech. That was their punishment, and that is about the only punishment they are going to get out of this administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RESTRICTION ON OCEAN DUMPING OFF NEW JERSEY COAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention that I just introduced H.R. 5092 along with my cosponsors, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), and the purpose of this legislation is to put in place as a matter of law a restriction on ocean dumping off the coast of New Jersey, actually at a site about 6 miles off the coast of my hometown in the 6th Congressional District, where several years ago myself and the two senators from New Jersey, Mr. TORRICELLI played a major role in this as well, worked out an agreement with the Federal Environmental Protection Agency that ocean dumping of toxic dredge materials would cease being dumped at this site called the mud dump site off the Jersey shore and that henceforth the site would be closed and the only thing that could be placed there would be clean fill material in order to remediate the site and serve as a cap for the toxic dredge materials that had been dumped there for so many years.

I was very disappointed last week when the EPA announced they were going to allow dredging once again of toxic materials from the Earl Naval Weapons Depot in my district in Leonardo, New Jersey, to be dumped at

this site, contrary to this agreement that had been worked out. The agreement specifically said that nothing could be used as remediation material and dumped at the mud dump site that exceeded what was called a standard or guideline of 113 parts per billion in terms of PCBs.

We know that PCBs are very damaging to human health, particularly when they get into the marine life, and they ultimately pass up through the food chain, and we had all agreed pursuant to this understanding several years ago that this standard or guideline of 113 would be the standard for any kind of materials that would have to be placed at the mud dump site.

Unfortunately, last week the EPA decided to give a waiver so that the Navy at Earl could dump materials that exceeded the 113 at the site, and yesterday, pursuant to a court action that was taken by U.S. Gypsum Company, the Federal court in New York ruled that because the EPA had not properly promulgated the 113 standard, that it could not be applied any more for ocean dumping, and now there is some concern about whether U.S. Gypsum and other companies would be able to dump again off the coast of New Jersey.

So this legislation is necessary in order to guarantee that ocean dumping does not continue. Myself, the two Senators from New Jersey and other Members of Congress have called upon the administrator of the EPA, Mrs. Whitman, our former governor, to put the 113 standard into regulation as a matter of law, and hopefully she will do that, but at the same time, in order to back that up, I think it is necessary for us to introduce legislation in the House that would accomplish the same goal, and that is what this legislation would attempt to do.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell my colleagues how important it is that we not continue to dump any kind of toxic material off the coast of New Jersey or anywhere else in the country. New Jersey's number one industry is tourism, and particularly now in July, after the July 4 holiday, there are so many people using the beaches, coming down to the Jersey Shore, both from New Jersey as well as New York and the State of Pennsylvania and even other States. If people do not feel or do not have the guarantee that the ocean water will be clean, obviously they are not going to swim and they should not swim.

The issue of ocean dumping does not just affect bathers. It affects marine life. It affects people who eat fish. It affects so many things along the coast of New Jersey and around the country, and I think it really is imperative that we stick to this standard of 113 parts per billion to make sure that human health is safeguarded and that we do not go back into the trend that we had so many years ago of continuing to dump everything in the ocean with the theory that somehow nobody would know about it and it would not make a difference.

It does make a difference. We have to have clean water, and this legislation hopefully will move quickly.

It is being sponsored and introduced in the Senate today by Senators Torricelli and Corzine from New Jersey, and hopefully we will get a lot more support for it and we can move it quickly so that it becomes law.

REPORT ON H.R. 5093, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mr. KOLBE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-564) on the bill (H.R. 5093) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT BETWEEN ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to discuss an important issue in the Horn of Africa, a final and binding resolution of the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea.

The Horn of Africa is one of the poorest regions in the world but also one of the most strategic. It is a region plagued by years of war and conflict, some of which were caused by colonial legacies, the Cold War, and border disputes, but now with the help of the international community, the nations of Eritrea and Ethiopia sit at the cusp of permanently breaking a cycle of conflict.

One of my top priorities when I came to this House was to help end conflict on the continent of Africa by serving as a member on the Subcommittee on Africa. There have been many wars in Africa. Some were just wars where African peoples fought to overthrow the yokes of colonialism and systems of

racism. However, other wars in Africa fall into the category of unjust or senseless wars.

□ 1345

In the category of senseless wars in Africa, very few would top the 2-year border war between Eritrea and Ethiopia, two former brothers-in-arms who once fought together for over 30 years against dictatorships and for the right to self-determination.

The conflict that erupted in 1998 between the two countries was the result of a dispute over land in a barren, roadless area of shrubs and desert, and subsequent claims of military incursions. Two years of fighting left tens of thousands of people dead and more than a million refugees on both sides of the border displaced. What made this war even more destructive was that these nations, two of the poorest nations in the world and dependent upon foreign aid, were able to spend \$3 billion to purchase weapons to wage this war.

Mr. Speaker, during the war, I always kept my doors open to officials from both nations. The only side I ever chose during the conflict was to stand on the side of all Ethiopians and all Eritreans who were committed to peace and who opposed the voices of militarism on either side.

On December 12, 2000, the two countries signed a United Nations-backed peace treaty, resulting in the end of hostilities and the creation of an independent commission to study and demarcate the disputed border area. According to the treaty, the border demarcation by the Hague Commission was to be final and binding. At the time, both countries stated their commitment to peace by vowing to fully implement the commission's ruling no matter what the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, on April 13 of this year, the Hague Commission released its decision on the demarcation of the Eritrean and Ethiopian border. Their decision reiterated the senselessness of the war by leaving the border substantially unaltered. Hence, what was this war about? Why did thousands of Ethiopians and Eritrean men and women have to die to resolve a border dispute?

Following the decision by the Hague Commission on May 13, 2002, the Ethiopian Government requested an interpretation of the commission's decision and order to implement the border demarcation process. While the original peace agreement gave no room for appeals by either party, the Hague Commission decided to accept the request by Ethiopia and pledged to provide a response within 30 days. This is why I wanted to speak on this issue today.

On June 24, the Hague Commission released its clarification report in response to Ethiopia's request. While the commission reviewed each of the points in Ethiopia's clarification request, it concluded by saying, "The Ethiopian request for clarification and interpretation appears to be founded on

a misapprehension regarding the scope and effect of the Boundary Commission's Rules of Procedure. The commission does not find in any of the items that appear in section 2, 3 or 4 of the Ethiopian request anything that identifies an uncertainty in the commission's decision that could be resolved by interpretation at this time. Accordingly, the commission concludes that the Ethiopian request is inadmissible and no further action will be taken upon it."

With this decision, it is high time for a newly created African Union, the United States, and the entire international community to emphasize the following points to the leaders of both Eritrea and Ethiopia:

One, that the Hague Commission's decision and reply to Ethiopia's clarification request must be adopted by both parties as the final decision, once and for all; that both countries must abide by the Hague Commission's ruling, and the international community should offer support to both nations to fully implement the decision.

Two, both societies should learn the lessons of the history of this war so that its causes are not repeated in the future. Conflicts over boundaries using extreme forms of nationalism or ethnic exaggerations are senseless struggles.

Finally, I would like to urge the leaders of both nations to have the courage to place the will of their citizens over the interests of their power and outdated ideas about security.

Neither society won anything from the war and both sides lost. Previous progress was set back and both Ethiopia and Eritrea wasted human and financial resources. The only winners in unjust wars, are international arms sellers and traders.

I am confident that the peoples of both nations are tired of war. It is up to the leadership of both nations to serve the will of their citizens and demonstrate the vision to chart an irreversible course towards a permanent peace. I would like to challenge the leaders of both nations to understand that real power comes from leading a strong and prosperous society in a nation that is respected and able to assume its rightful place and responsibilities in the global community.

More importantly, real security and sustainable processes of peace are not attainable simply by having defined borders and territorial integrity. In this era of globalization, well defined borders and territorial integrity do not and can not always guarantee security.

Yes borders and territorial integrity are important, but they can't prevent instability and insecurity in any nation whose citizens face poverty, health crises and other forms of violence. Real security for any nation or society in the 21st century is linked to the degree of the political, social and economic conditions, rights, and opportunities of its citizens.

So I say to the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea: Accept the principle contained in OAU's framework for peace agreement which calls for both sides to: "Reject the use of force as a means of proposing solutions to disputes." Recognize that it is in your national security interests to accept the ruling as final and binding. Recognize that it is in your national strategic interests to put a senseless

war behind you once and for all, because you have real wars to wage.

A war against poverty and HIV-AIDS which demand that both governments shift the focus of your energies and your scarce resources to not only to rebuild your economies to help those hurt most by the war, your citizens. But to also face the challenges of transforming the public and private institutions and structures in the economy for the development of your societies in the 21st century.

These are the wars which must be waged if the vision of a strong and vibrant African Union is going to be realized. An African Union which needs the Horn of Africa to be stable. I will work in this Congress to support new forms of broad based US engagement with both nations, as long as both nations demonstrate their commitment to fighting for peace, development, health care, education and democracy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair announces that at 2 p.m. we will cut off 5-minute special orders, and so we will expeditiously move forward.

HIV-AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the brutality of the corporate scandal that has occurred here in this Nation is one that clearly we should all be concerned about. But the idea of ignoring the crisis of HIV-AIDS should be one that we abhor.

When I refer to the tragedy of the corporate scandal here in the United States, it is to the loss that so many have suffered and so many millions and billions of dollars that have been lost. It is my belief that those billions of dollars could be vitally used for the tragedy of what is going on in HIV-AIDS.

It is important to note that the World Conference on AIDS has said progress has been made. But in addition to progress being made, we also find that there is much work to be done, particularly as it relates to the infection of HIV-AIDS, to the issues dealing with immune systems and the kinds of infections that are now becoming immune to the various drugs that are being utilized, the lack of monies for developing nations, the lack of dollars for helping with the mother-to-child infection transmission. We have found that where you have the circumstance of mother-to-child transmission and you have intervention, you will find that it works to save lives.

The increase of HIV-infected persons is enormous. The increase in countries like India and Bangladesh and China is enormous. The number of HIV-infected people who do not know that they are infected is enormous. The key thing we must do is to be able to find a way to address this question.

The Millennium Project has been announced. There has been a request for \$1 billion. There has been an additional request for \$2 billion. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that that is not enough. We are being tortured in this country by our own increase in HIV-AIDS, particularly among African American women, and I believe it is important for us to be able to focus our concern on many issues.

Corporate accountability is particularly important, as is corporate responsibility. Accountability is particularly important. So, too, are the concerns regarding HIV-AIDS infection, as has been indicated by the World Conference on AIDS.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to address the House on this very important issue because we cannot forget. As we parallel our track on the issues of corporate accountability and recognizing the billions of dollars that have been lost in insider trading and the need to provide security for our own employees with pension reform and protections as relates to bankruptcy issues, we cannot afford to lose sight of the devastation of HIV-AIDS.

I am looking forward to working on the increase in funds coming from this House and this body, and the President signing legislation to intervene internationally on the tremendous costs of HIV-AIDS. We lose people, we lose the ability for nations to thrive and grow, we undermine their economy, and they simply cannot thrive. They cannot feed the malnourished, they cannot provide affordable housing, and they cannot provide education because large percentages of their budget are taken up with issues such as HIV-AIDS.

We need to do proactive things, and one of them is to increase the relief or the forgiving of the debt that our Third World developing nations have so they can use those resources to provide health care for those in need. South Africa has been a leader, Zimbabwe; Zambia has been a leader, and now it is important that we find our way to emphasize HIV-AIDS intervention and protection thereof.

This is an important issue. It is important for this Nation, and I cannot leave, Mr. Speaker, without acknowledging that each is our brother's keeper. We are our brothers' and sisters' keepers, and as we need to help those in this country, we must help those who are seeking our aid in fighting HIV-AIDS and the intervention of such.

FARM SUBSIDIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Appropriations marked up and passed out the agricultural appropriations bill. That will be on the House floor next week.

In that effort this morning, there was an attempt to put language into that appropriations bill that would have the effect of having limits on the payments that go out to some of the very, very, big, big farmers. That amendment was squelched. A tremendous amount of pressure.

In the House, where we attempted to instruct conferees when the farm bill went through, that vote was overwhelming in giving the will of this House, this body, that we should have some kind of payment limits for farmers on farm price supports.

Let me just briefly, Mr. Speaker, explain the problem. We sort of hoodwink a lot of the American people by saying there are limits on what a farmer can receive. Not so. Because there is a loophole in the law. It is called generic certificates. After a farmer reaches the \$75,000 limit that is allocated in the bill as a limit, from that point on there is a gimmick called generic certificates, that the government will sell the farmer the generic certificate to pay for the commodity. The farmer ends up getting the same kind of benefit as what is limited under the \$75,000 limitation.

I would call to my colleagues' attention that next week we are trying to get language in the agricultural appropriations bill that will have some kind of a limit. So some of the farmers that are huge, that are big, are not getting million dollar payments that put the smaller farmer at a very distinct disadvantage, and that is good policy.

We should not have programs that wipe the small farmer out, and that is what is happening. Because the farm program is capitalized on land values, land values have gone up because of this last farm bill, and that means that it is harder for a small farmer to survive.

Let me just ask my colleagues to seriously look at this issue in the next several days and consider the amendment that we intend to offer on the floor.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

VIDEO GAME BILL

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation is defending ourselves from attacks from abroad, we are facing another battle here at home. We are in a battle for the hearts and the minds and souls of our children. We must address the cultural issues that are influencing the behavior of our children.

They are being drowned by the flood of sex and violence from the video game industry. When four out of five kids walk into the neighborhood stores and buy video games that show people having sex with prostitutes, killing police officers, using drugs, and attacking our senior citizens, it is time to take action. These games are brainwashing our children. They teach them the skills and the will to kill.

I am a parent, a grandparent, and I have had enough of violence that we

are experiencing amongst our youth. From Columbine, from Texas, to Germany we have seen the tragic consequences of youth violence.

The video game industry is a \$9 billion industry. But it is not about money, it is about our children. As an adult, you can shoot a gun, you can drink a beer, you can smoke a cigar. But if you are giving these substances to a child, you are a criminal. When it comes to video games with violent or sexual content, the same should be true.

The pornography industry, the gun industry, the tobacco industry, and the alcohol industry all accept regulations on their products when it comes to kids. And so must the video industry do the same.

We, as parents, need to take responsibility for our children. We have to monitor where and what they are learning and the type of behavior. We are the first and last line of defense. But stores also have a responsibility. Parents cannot be undermined by stores that are only looking to make a profit.

□ 1400

Nine out of 10 parents want the stores to prevent our children from buying these games. The fact is that these stores are not enforcing their own policies. When stores have to decide whether to sell a game or make it quick, they do not enforce the policies. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 4645, the Protect Children from Video Game Sex and Violence Act.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1643

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida) at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, on roll-calls 288 and 291, I inadvertently voted "no" when I intended and should have voted "yes."

THE 14TH INTERNATIONAL AIDS CONFERENCE FOR KNOWLEDGE AND COMMITMENT TO ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this weekend in Barcelona, Spain, 15,000 people came

together for the 14th International AIDS Conference for Knowledge and Commitment for Action.

I had the privilege to participate in this very important conference and can say with certainty that while Congress and the administration are waking up to the desperate call of millions of individuals living with HIV and AIDS, and those yet to be born to this scourge, we are still not doing enough.

Let me bring the Members up to date on this global pandemic. In 2001, there were 5 million new AIDS infections across the globe. Today there are 40 million people living with AIDS worldwide, and there are 14 million AIDS orphans.

In the United States, 950,000 have been diagnosed with AIDS. African Americans make up only 13 percent of the total United States population, but 54 percent of new infections and 82 percent of women who are newly infected with HIV are African American and Hispanic.

In my district in Oakland, California, we declared a state of emergency in order to focus attention on this tragic, tragic crisis. The latest statistics indicate that the number of new infections is slowing in Alameda County; yet we must do more.

□ 1645

AIDS is a disease that affects the entire human family. It has impacted every corner of the Earth. Therefore, we must discuss this problem in a global context. We must address prevention, treatment, vaccines, access, and funding in a comprehensive fashion.

At the conference, I heard repeated over and over again that while developing a vaccine we must help developing countries develop the required health care delivery systems and infrastructure to ensure equal access. We cannot repeat the pattern we have seen on the African continent where access to anti-retroviral drugs and AIDS treatment are far from equal. Currently in Africa more than 28 million people are living with HIV and AIDS. However, only 30,000 are in treatment. In comparison to the United States, nearly 100 percent of people who are infected are in treatment and they need it and they receive it.

At the conference we again engaged the ongoing debate over prevention versus treatment. Most concluded, and rightfully so, that it must not be an either/or dilemma. Working to prevent the mother-to-child transmission must not exclude keeping the mother, father and child alive. Once again, there is no way we should buy into an either/or strategy.

While I am pleased that President Bush has acknowledged the need for drugs to reduce mother-to-child transmissions, that is only one component of what should be a multifaceted approach to tackling this pandemic. In Barcelona at a remarkable AIDS march for life, thousands came together to call for treatment now and presented

the Barcelona Declaration, which was read into the opening session of the conference.

This declaration called for securing donations of \$10 billion per year for global AIDS; antiretroviral treatment for at least 2 million people with HIV/AIDS in the developing world by 2004; lower affordable drug prices and universal access to generics in the developing world; and a new global partnership between government and NGOs.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Barcelona Declaration is as follows:

BARCELONA DECLARATION

\$10 BILLION FOR AIDS TREATMENT

2 MILLION PEOPLE WORLDWIDE IN TREATMENT BY 2004

Whereas every single day AIDS claims 8,500 lives, or the equivalent of three World Trade Center disasters daily;

Whereas by December 2001, 40 million people were living with HIV/AIDS, and by 2005 an estimated 100 million will be infected;

Whereas more than 40 million children—most of them in developing nations—will be orphaned by AIDS by 2010;

Whereas the World Health Organization this year has stated that anti-retroviral treatment is medically essential and has issued specific treatment guidelines, monitoring standards and regimen recommendations;

Whereas those on treatment represent less than 2% of all those infected with HIV because such treatment is almost completely unavailable in developing nations;

Whereas over 500 non-governmental organizations globally have endorsed the Barcelona March for Life, which demands treatment access to at least 2 million individuals in the developing world by the time of the 2004 International Conference on AIDS in Bangkok;

Whereas these organizations represent AIDS activists from Africa, Asia and the Pacific Islands, Australia, Europe, Central and South America, and North America

Therefore, we declare as activists pledged to life for all persons with HIV/AIDS that we are committed to the following goals:

1. Securing donation of \$10 billion dollars per year for global AIDS;

2. Antiretroviral (ARV) treatment for at least two million people with HIV/AIDS in the developing world by the 2004 Bangkok AIDS conference;

3. Lower, affordable ARV drug prices in the developed world and universal access to generics in the developing world by Bangkok, 2004; and

4. A new global partnership between government and NGOs recognizing the primary role of NGOs in the global fight against AIDS.

We call on the delegates of the Barcelona International AIDS Conference to pledge themselves to these goals.

Now, I must mention a very disappointing turn of events leading up to the Barcelona conference. Many African delegates, especially those living with HIV and AIDS, were singled out and denied visas by Spain for questionable reasons. Therefore, the conference did not benefit from the insights of those living with this disease at its epicenter in Africa. We lost the voices we heard at the 13th conference in Durban, South Africa, in 2000.

In Barcelona we heard many strategies and staggering statistics of lives destroyed, but we also heard models of

hope. In Uganda, Thailand and Senegal, for example, strong national leadership partnered with community-wide response are reducing new HIV infections and AIDS diagnoses and focusing on treatment measures for their people.

We must continue to support these efforts by increasing U.S. bilateral and multilateral funding for vital AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria programs. I am even more convinced that the United States must put at least, and this is a minimum, just at least \$1 billion into the global trust fund for starters. Dr. Peter Piot, the director of UNAIDS, said that a \$10 billion effort will only begin to make a dent in this crisis. We will never see a favorable result in a crisis of this magnitude if we continue to nickel and dime our efforts.

I agree that we must streamline bureaucracy and facilitate better coordination, but that should happen while we ramp up our response. Together in a bipartisan effort we must now move forward with appropriate significant resources for this life-and-death effort. It is time to put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and his very diligent staff, and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and his staff, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and Mary Andrus of his staff, and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), and Michael Riggs of my staff for making HIV/AIDS a priority of the Committee on International Relations.

THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF MAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have always been interested in origins. Even though my training is in the law and in history, it has ever been an avocation of mine to contemplate and to study the origins of man and of life here on Earth.

Many theories of origins have been propounded throughout our Nation's history. In 1859, a sincere biologist returned from the Galapagos Islands and wrote a book entitled "The Origins of Species," in which Charles Darwin offered a theory of the origin of species which we have come to know as evolution. Charles Darwin never thought of evolution as anything other than a theory. He hoped that some day it would be proven by the fossil record but did not live to see that, nor have we.

In 1925 in the famous Scopes Monkey Trial, this theory made its way through litigation into the classrooms of America, and we have all seen the consequences over the last 77 years: evolution not taught as a sincere theory of a biologist, but rather, Mr.

Speaker, taught as fact. Unless anyone listening in would doubt that, we can all see in our mind's eye that grade school classroom that we all grew up in with the linear depiction of evolution just above the chalkboard. There is the monkey crawling on the grass. There is the Neanderthal dragging his knuckles and then there is Mel Gibson standing in all of his glory.

It is what we have been taught, that man proceeded and evolved along linear lines. But now comes a new find by paleontologists. In the newspapers all across America, a new study in "Nature" magazine, 6- to 7-million-year-old skull has been unearthed, the Toumai skull and it suggests that human evolution was actually, according to a new theory, human evolution was taking place, and I am quoting now, "all across Africa and the Earth," and the Earth was once truly, and I quote, "a planet of the apes on which nature was experimenting with many human-like creatures."

Paleontologists are excited about this, Mr. Speaker. But no one is pointing out that the textbooks will need to be changed because the old theory of evolution taught for 77 years in the classrooms of America as fact is suddenly replaced by a new theory, or I hasten to add, I am sure we will be told a new fact.

The truth is it always was a theory, Mr. Speaker. And now that we have recognized evolution as a theory, I would simply and humbly ask, can we teach it as such and can we also consider teaching other theories of the origin of species? Like the theory that was believed in by every signer of the Declaration of Independence. Every signer of the Declaration of Independence believed that men and women were created and were endowed by that same Creator with certain unalienable rights. The Bible tells us that God created man in his own image, male and female. He created them. And I believe that, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that God created the known universe, the Earth and everything in it, including man. And I also believe that someday scientists will come to see that only the theory of intelligent design provides even a remotely rational explanation for the known universe. But until that day comes, and I have no fear of science, I believe that the more we study the science, the more the truth of faith will become apparent. I would just humbly ask as new theories of evolution find their ways into the newspapers and into the textbooks, let us demand that educators around America teach evolution not as fact, but as theory, and an interesting theory to boot. But let us also bring into the minds of all of our children all of the theories about the unknowable that some bright day in the future through science and perhaps through faith we will find the truth from whence we come.

14TH INTERNATIONAL AIDS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too recently had the privilege of attending the 14th International AIDS Conference in Barcelona, Spain. I want to thank the House leadership for making it possible for me to join the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). AIDS experts, activists and government representatives from all over the world assembled to share their invaluable knowledge and expertise in fighting the global HIV/AIDS pandemic and issuing a call to action.

This is a critically important conference happening at a very important time. UNAIDS and the World Health Organization recently released an updated report of where we are today. The most important thing to realize is that we are still at the beginning, the beginning of this terrible scourge. Yet there are already over 40 million people estimated to be living with HIV/AIDS around the world today and an estimated 28 million who have died. At this incipient stage of the pandemic, there are already 13.4 million children orphaned by this disease. More than a third of those living with HIV and AIDS are under the age of 25.

There are 5 million new infections each year, 6,000 new every day; and young people ages 15 to 24 account for half of all new infections. Even in developed nations such as the United States, young people continue to represent half of all new infections; and yet this is only the beginning. What lies ahead, the future course of this pandemic is in large measure in the hands of this body and our government.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a critical stage in this pandemic. A major crossroads where our decision to act or not to act, or not to act fully, will determine the course of our own and world history from this time forward.

Several things became increasingly clear even in the few days I was able to attend the conference. First, we have wasted a lot of time arguing over prevention versus treatment, and with that many lives have been lost and others changed forever. We have made dangerous and deadly assumptions that have kept life-saving treatments out of the hands of those who could otherwise have been saved. We have provided but token funding; and because we are falling short, the needed infrastructure is not in place to allow programs that began in homes, churches and community meeting places to expand across the infected countries so that they could save more lives and get on with the work of nation building.

We, the United States, have the power to make the difference, to dramatically change the course of this dreaded disease by meeting our commitment to the global trust fund and

by exerting our influence on the other industrialized nations to meet theirs. Yet the United States, the richest country in the world, despite the fanfare surrounding recent increases in our contributions, ranks last in those who have pledged for the global trust fund.

To continue to fund this epidemic in drips and drabbles would be unconscionable because our delays and the delays of other nations have already caused it to spiral completely out of control on a global scale.

Today, at home, our ADAP program needs an additional \$80 million and the minority AIDS initiative needs \$450 million. Globally, 10 billion dollars is what is needed every year; and we must commit and act to contribute at least our full share, not over a period of time, but now.

It should be exceedingly clear that we cannot continue to fall short of providing the required level of funding. If we continue at the present level, we can anticipate another 45 million new infected persons within the next 20 years. It would also mean that there would be 20 million new children left without a mother or father, alone to grow up as orphans, denied of love and nurturing and probably education since the teachers too are among the dying. This portends a serious and ever-increasing threat to the national security of the most effected countries and, unless we think otherwise, also to ours.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the time for arguing over what must come first must be behind us. We must have treatment and prevention. We must find ways in this dire emergency to put life-saving medication within the reach of all who need it. Neither should research be pitted against prevention and treatment, because the need for vaccine, which may be just a few years ahead and which is where hope truly lies, must be given all the resources it needs to go forward. As we approach its availability, we must begin to work even now to avoid the gaps in access that we are still working to address in the case of medication.

Lastly, we can not tie the hands of health professionals, community organizations, and workers as they work on the front lines of this epidemic. Family planning funding or population funding provides much of the first line of defense. Continuing to impose the values of a minority of Americans on countries where there are people just fighting to live by denying them the basic staff and supplies is not befitting a country that is built on Christian values and principles.

I join my colleagues today to call on the leadership of this body and our President to provide the funding, to lift the gag, release the funding for all international family planning programs and provide the leadership which has always been our hallmark by making the full contribution to the global trust fund and influencing all of our allies to do the same.

□ 1700

WHERE'S THE MONEY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my time that I am allotted tonight to talk a little bit about the loss of \$17.3 billion.

On June 6 of this year I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the reason that I wrote this letter is because I had been back in North Carolina during the break and I was listening to a talk show and they were quoting from the New York Post, and I want to read the first two paragraphs of this article.

It says, May 28, 2002, Washington complains about deceptive corporate accounting, but the government last year misplaced an incredible \$17.3 billion because of shoddy bookkeeping or worse. Again, the article says, Let me put that into numbers so that you can fully appreciate the amount. It is \$17.3 billion, the price of a few dozen urban renewal projects, a nice size fleet of warships or about half the tax cut that everyone made such a fuss about last year.

In addition, the London Times also wrote an article on the fact that we in this Nation, that our accounting system for this government, that we have lost or misplaced \$17.3 billion.

I share with my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle my frustration and disgust with what happened with Enron and also with WorldCom, but I do want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that as sad as that is, and it is terribly sad, that the investors had a choice to make an investment. The taxpayers do not have a choice. They are mandated by law to pay their taxes.

So, therefore, we collect their taxes and yet in the year 2001, we have, and this is the term used, unreconciled transactions in the amount of \$17.3 billion.

So this is about my third or fourth week of coming to the floor, and I actually on June 6, I wrote Secretary O'Neill a letter, and I am just going to read two paragraphs. I said, The report provides minimal data and information regarding these unreconciled transactions. Not only is the Federal Government missing \$17.3 billion but there is no reason given for this loss. While I appreciate the Department of Treasury's statement, the identification and accurate reporting of these unreconciled transactions is a priority. The fact remains, the public nor the Congress has the information on how this loss occurred, what agencies were responsible for this unreconciled transactional; would these transactions eventually be reconciled; if so, what is the time line for this reconciliation; what agency or agencies will be responsible for the reconciliation; will this

reconciliation be available to the public when completed.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am down here on the floor, I realize the Secretary is a very busy man, but I did write this letter on June 6 of this year, and I have not received a response. I am going to give the Secretary the benefit of the doubt, that like many of us here in the Congress, we have wonderful assistants that sometimes get the mail and they go through the letters before we see them. So I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt. I did write on June 27 a letter to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and I have asked that the oversight committee hold a hearing on this issue of where we have misplaced the \$17.3 billion.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to come to the floor. Next week, I will have a chart that I will hold up before me as I speak, reminding the American people that we in Congress, on both sides of the political aisle, want to find out where that \$17.3 billion of the taxpayers' money has gone, and if it has been misspent or misplaced, somebody needs to answer for it.

HONORING ANDREA FOX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Andrea Fox of San Rafael, California, a talented professional planner, community volunteer, athlete and breast cancer activist, and an inspiration to everyone who knew her.

Andrea Fox lost her life in a battle against breast cancer on July 2 at the age of 35, leaving a legacy of extraordinary courage and compassion. A beautiful young woman with incredible grace and dignity, Annie Fox was dedicated to finding a cure for breast cancer. Diagnosed with a particularly aggressive cancer in 1998, the former triathlete, who ate organically and exercised regularly, had none of the traditional risk factors for cancer.

Undergoing a lumpectomy, she continued her athletic training and stage IV cancer seemed to disappear. But in April 2000, the cancer came back, and pursuing every treatment she could find, including non-Western, nontraditional methods, Annie appeared to have beaten it back again.

Andrea focused her considerable energies on increasing public awareness and getting national attention for this serious epidemic of breast cancer in Marin County, joining the board of Marin Breast Cancer Watch. "Annie was one of our angels," said board president Roni Mentzer.

Whether lobbying in Sacramento for breast cancer research or educating the community about the dangerously high rates of cancer in Marin County, Annie made a difference. She made history.

Never daunted, she participated in athletic events such as the renowned

Dipsea race and the human race, and she organized new events like the July 20, 2002 foot race from Mill Valley to the Mountain Theater on Mount Tamalpais to increase public knowledge and raise much-needed funds for research.

In October 2001, only 2 months after her engagement to long-time partner and soulmate Chris Stewart, the cancer came back and Annie mounted still another heroic campaign. Not one to seek sympathy, she was driven to passionately lead the fight for all women to find a cause for this insidious disease.

Despite increasing pain, she continued her work at the Marin Civic Center. "Annie was a special person," Stewart said, "bringing a wonderful happiness to all those who knew her. She was passionate about her work and about preserving the environment."

A woman of uncommon positive spirit, Andrea Fox lost her courageous battle with breast cancer surrounded by friends and family, leaving her devoted fiancée, her mother, her brother and a grieving community.

We are all more fortunate to have been graced by the presence of Andrea Fox, her beauty, her wisdom and her strength. Her love, resolve and remarkable will are cornerstones for the legacy of courage she has left so that we might continue the fight.

While Annie is gone, the spirit of this angel of our community will forever be with us.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2003 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2003 THROUGH FY 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2003 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 301 of House Concurrent Resolution 353, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House. This status report is current through July 11, 2002.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 353. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2003 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made

under H. Con. Res. 353 for fiscal year 2003 and fiscal years 2003 through 2007. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. A separate allocation for the Medicare program, as established under section 213(d) of the budget resolution, is shown for fiscal year 2003 and fiscal years 2003 through 2012. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2003 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2004 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 301 of H. Con. Res. 353 printed in the Congressional Record on May 22, 2002. This list is needed to enforce section 301 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2002

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2003		2003–2007 total		2003–2012 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:						
Allocation	7,825	7,271	37,017	34,479	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	8,532	8,406	49,206	47,592	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	707	1,135	12,189	13,113	n.a.	n.a.
Armed Services:						
Allocation	516	516	5,804	5,804	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	–516	–516	–5,804	–5,804	n.a.	n.a.
Banking and Financial Services:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Commerce:						
Allocation	95	59	2,709	2,649	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	776	776	–795	–795	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	681	717	–3,504	–3,444	n.a.	n.a.
International Relations:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Government Reform:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
House Administration:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Resources:						
Allocation	0	0	700	700	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	–700	–700	n.a.	n.a.
Judiciary:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Small Business:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	0	0	17,476	0	n.a.	n.a.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION
COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2002—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2003		2003–2007 total		2003–2012 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	–17,476	0	n.a.	n.a.
Science:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	2,203	174	7,855	5,861	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	–2,203	–174	–7,855	–5,861	n.a.	n.a.
Medicare:						
Allocation	4,650	4,575	n.a.	n.a.	347,270	347,270
Current Level	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
Difference	–4,650	–4,575	n.a.	n.a.	–347,270	–347,270

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 24, 2002 (H. Rpt. 107–529) ¹		Current level reflecting ac- tion completed as of July 11, 2002		Current level minus sub- allocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	17,601	17,907	12	4,913	–17,589	–12,994
Commerce, Justice, State	40,333	43,104	0	13,635	–40,333	–29,469
National Defense	354,447	346,110	0	99,708	–354,447	–246,402
District of Columbia	517	581	0	111	–517	–470
Energy & Water Development	26,027	25,824	0	8,795	–26,027	–17,029
Foreign Operations	16,350	16,481	0	10,281	–16,350	–6,200
Interior	19,670	18,969	36	6,431	–19,634	–12,538
Labor, HHS & Education	128,902	125,701	19,128	84,622	–110,774	–41,079
Legislative Branch	3,413	3,467	0	592	–3,413	–2,875
Military Construction	10,083	10,058	0	7,349	–10,083	–2,709
Transportation ²	19,411	60,767	20	37,185	–19,391	–23,582
Treasury—Postal Service	18,501	18,237	45	4,358	–18,456	–13,879
VA—HUD—Independent Agencies	91,841	97,713	3,448	52,302	–88,393	–45,411
Unassigned	0	271	0	0	0	–271
Grand Total	748,096	785,190	22,689	330,282	–725,407	–454,908

¹ Reflects 2003 outlays from FY2002 appropriations contained in H.R. 4775, making supplemental appropriations act for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States.

² Does not include mass transit BA.

STATEMENT OF FY 2004 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 301 OF H. CON. RES. 353 REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2002

Interior Subcommittee: Elk Hills.
Labor, Health and Human Services Education Subcommittee: Employment and Training Administration, Education for the Disadvantaged, School Improvement, Children and Family Services (head start), Special Education, Vocational and Adult Education.

Transportation Subcommittee: Transportation (highways; transit; Farley Building).
Treasury, General Government Subcommittee: Payment to Postal Service.

Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee: Section 8 renewals.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2003 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 353 REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2002

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2003	Fiscal years 2003–2007
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,784,073	n.a.
Outlays	1,767,146	n.a.
Revenues	1,531,893	8,671,656
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,045,172	n.a.
Outlays	1,304,705	n.a.
Revenues	1,536,324	8,699,516
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–738,901	n.a.
Outlays	–462,441	n.a.
Revenues	4,431	27,860

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2003 through 2007 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

Budget Authority.—Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2003 in excess of \$738,901,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2003 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 353.

Outlays.—Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2003 in excess of \$462,441,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2003 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 353.

Revenues.—Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2003 in excess of \$4,431,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 353.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period FY 2003 through 2007 in excess of \$27,860,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 353.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2002.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2003 budget and is current through July 11, 2002. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended. This is my first letter for fiscal year 2003.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 353, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2003. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements. These revisions are required by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since the beginning of the second session of the 107th Congress, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority and outlays for 2003: the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2003 (Public Law 107–147), the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171), the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–188), and the Auction Reform Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–195). The effects of these new laws are identified in the enclosed table.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JULY 11, 2002

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	0	0	1,536,324
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,090,473	1,038,707	0
Appropriation legislation	0	313,127	0
Offsetting receipts	-346,866	-346,866	0
Total, previously enacted	743,607	1,004,968	1,536,324
Enacted this session:			
Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-147)	3,524	3,587	0
Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-171)	8,532	8,406	0
Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-188)	1	1	0
Auction Reform Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-195)	775	775	0
Total, enacted this session	12,832	12,769	0
Entitlements and Mandatories: Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	288,733	286,968	0
Total Current Level	1,045,172	1,304,705	1,536,324
Total Budget Resolution	1,784,073	1,767,146	1,531,893
Current Level Over Budget resolution	0	0	4,431
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	-738,901	-462,441	0
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2003-2007:			
House Current Level ¹	0	0	8,699,516
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,671,656
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	27,860

¹ The revenue effects of the Clergy Housing Allowance Clarification Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-181) begin in 2004 and are included in this revenue figure.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L.=Public Law.

Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that the House Budget Committee revise the budget resolution to reflect funding provided in bills reported by the House for emergency requirements. To date, the Budget Committee has increased the outlay allocation in the budget resolution by \$10,714 million for this purpose. This amount is not included in the current level because the funding has not yet been enacted.

GLOBAL HIV, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight, and I want to especially thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and applaud her for her work in bringing us together here tonight to talk about the HIV pandemic. We have all been closely following the happenings this week at the 14th International AIDS Conference in Barcelona, Spain, and although it is exciting to hear about the new research breakthroughs and findings, it is also disheartening to hear about the sheer number of people who are infected and affected by this disease throughout the world.

More than 40 million people are living with HIV worldwide, and nearly 5 million of those people were diagnosed with HIV just last year alone. Ninety-six percent of those people living with HIV reside in developing countries, Third World countries and, for example, 1.5 million children and adults in Latin America alone are living with HIV. About 130,000 of these were diagnosed just last year.

Unfortunately, many HIV-positive individuals do not even know they have the deadly disease. We still have a long way to go to raise awareness about the disease and to ensure that Nations have the resources to implement proven prevention and treatment programs. We must do more to help our global neighbors combat this deadly disease.

UNAIDS has estimated that between \$7 billion and \$10 billion is needed each year to effectively respond to the global HIV/AIDS epidemic, but during this last fiscal year, the United States only contributed an estimated \$1 billion to HIV and AIDS research. This includes a \$200 million of contribution to the

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and I think that is great, but we can do a lot better.

It is important to note that aid for global HIV effort is more than a moral responsibility. It is an economic and political necessity. Countries with AIDS face economic and social threats as governments struggle with the burden of trying to pay for HIV treatment and prevention, and often the populations most affected by HIV are the key to the economic stability of these nations.

As an example, these people are the ones between the age of 15 and 24 years old. They represent 42 percent of the newest HIV infections and make up about one-third of the global total of people living with AIDS. When these people face the threat of AIDS, their families and communities are devastated and, of course, HIV also has a particularly devastating impact on the youngest of our global population.

Worldwide, an estimated 14 million children under the age of 15 have lost one or both parents from AIDS. The stories of children who are orphaned by AIDS are heartbreaking to all of us. We cannot afford to ignore the AIDS crisis. We must commit ourselves to doing more, and I hope that this Congress can make that commitment, and I certainly urge and strongly urge the President of the United States to do the same.

CALLING FOR U.S. ACTION ON GLOBAL HIV AND AIDS PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to talk about the global AIDS pandemic and the catastrophic consequences of doing so little, too little to combat it here at home and around the world.

Here at home, HIV and AIDS is the number one killer of young black men. Here in the United States, where most are able to afford or have access to the standard of care for this disease, the instance of mortality has declined sharply, thanks to antiretroviral combination therapy. But make no mistake about it, HIV is a clever, still lethal virus, and the emphasis of these drugs is limited.

For many who have developed resistance to these drugs, the treatment is called salvage therapy. Think about the term, salvage therapy. It is shocking and sad that the two words are used in the same breath, but it is true.

The pharmaceutical industry, often with substantial government funding and research support from NIH and CDC, has made great strides, and it will have to do so again because many of the newest HIV cases are diagnosed resistant to one or more of the existing drugs. I call on the pharmaceutical industry to redouble its effort to consider spending much less on public relations and marketing and much more on research and development.

I would ask this Congress to take up and pass the legislation authored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who has long advocated for an anti-AIDS effort similar to the Manhattan Project.

Twenty million people have died from AIDS in the last two decades. According to the United Nations AIDS agency, 70 million more people could perish in the next 20 years.

Looking internationally, the picture is bleak and in danger of becoming a world destabilizing force, a holocaust due to woefully inadequate resources. The problem is not limited to African nations, which currently have the greatest share of the infection. Other developing countries, as well as Russia and China, are only just coming to grips with the severity of the HIV and AIDS epidemic.

The devastation of vast percentages of populations in African nations will create national security concerns for the United States and other nations within the near future unless we act now to arrest and eradicate this scourge.

Sub-Saharan Africa represents 77 percent of AIDS deaths, 70 percent of HIV-infected people and nearly 70 percent of all new infections and 90 percent of children infected with the virus.

□ 1715

These are truly, truly grim statistics.

We will not begin to change these numbers until we begin to invest as though HIV-AIDS were a profound threat to the public health worldwide and a threat to national security as well. We cannot afford to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Eight thousand five hundred people die each day from AIDS, more than twice as many as perished on September 11. Another sobering statistic.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, for her continuous leadership on the complex issues involved with HIV and AIDS. I share her concern that support for another \$1 billion contribution by the United States to the Global Trust Fund is needed. We are obligated to do that. We are morally challenged to do that. We need to do that to support comprehensive prevention and treatment efforts, and, ultimately, to find a cure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HIV/AIDS PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to draw attention to the ongoing HIV/AIDS pandemic.

This week, the 16th Annual International AIDS Conference was held in Barcelona, Spain. The conference highlighted the fact that, contrary to previous beliefs, the global AIDS crisis has not peaked and is only getting worse. According to UNAIDS, 40 million people live with HIV/AIDS in the world today; 28.5 million of them are in sub-Saharan Africa. Three million of those infected are children younger than 15. Last year, five million people were newly infected with HIV, and three million died of AIDS.

In Botswana, almost 44 percent of pregnant women visiting clinics in urban areas are HIV

positive. In several countries in West Africa—such as Burkina Faso and Cameroon—the adult prevalence rate surpassed 5 percent, a level that many experts agree precedes a larger scale epidemic. This devastating disease is erasing decades of development and cutting life expectancy by nearly half in the most affected areas.

These statistics are staggering, but they also obscure the human cost of the epidemic. Infected teachers pass away and are unable to transmit knowledge to the next generation. Business owners die and their enterprises die with them. The deaths of trained professionals, such as nurses, civil servants, and lawyers mean that their skills disappear from their country. By 2010, UNAIDS believes that twenty million children in sub-Saharan Africa will have lost at least one of their parents to AIDS. Mr. Speaker, entire societies are being destroyed by this terrible virus.

There are a few—very few—signs of hope. Some countries, such as Uganda, have stemmed the rate of infection and have averted a wider catastrophe. Other countries are finally acknowledging that HIV/AIDS poses a serious risk to their stability and are beginning to remove the stigma associated with the disease. Last week, the government of Nigeria announced that it had ordered free HIV/AIDS test for half a million of its citizens. And programs that seek to prevent the transmission of the virus from mothers to children are proving to be effective and are being implemented on a larger scale.

But Mr. Speaker, there is more that we as the sole superpower can do to stop the spread of this scourge that threatens the stability of many parts of the globe. We can increase assistance for education and prevention efforts and involve more sectors of societies in such prevention campaigns. We can continue to lower the cost of life-saving anti-retroviral drugs so that people in developing countries have the hope of treatment and are more willing to learn their HIV status. We can support the research and development of an effective, practical vaccine for HIV. And we can increase the United States' contributions for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria.

What we are doing simply is not enough to stem this global massacre. As a world leader, we must step up our efforts and contributions in this global struggle.

GLOBAL AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for organizing today's Special Orders on Global AIDS.

Over the past 5 days, the 14th International AIDS Conference has been meeting in Barcelona, Spain. The statistics that have been reported at the Conference are devastating. More than one in five adults in seven sub-Saharan African countries are already infected with HIV. In Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Zimbabwe, the rate is one in three.

The AIDS pandemic will cause a decline in life expectancy in 51 countries over the next two decades. This demographic effect is without precedent in modern times. Seven coun-

tries in sub-Saharan Africa now have average life expectancies of less than 40 years. By the end of this decade, 11 African countries will have life expectancies of less than 40 years. This is a level they have not experienced since the end of the 1800s. Sub-Saharan countries could lose 25 percent of their labor forces by 2002.

At the Conference, there was overwhelming support for a \$7–10 billion annual commitment to fight global AIDS. This worldwide commitment should begin with a commitment of \$2.5 billion from the United States in fiscal year 2003. Unfortunately, the countries that attended the recent G-8 Summit offered only empty promises of more development assistance for Africa. We need to do more.

On March 12, 2002, I sent a letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee requesting a total of \$2.5 billion in the fiscal year 2003 budget for bilateral and multilateral HIV/AIDS programs. Sixty-eight Members of Congress signed this letter, but our letter was ignored.

I call on this Congress to provide \$2.5 billion for the fight against global AIDS in fiscal year 2003.

U.S. ROLE IN HIV-AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for bringing this issue and for taking the time to take the trip to Barcelona and go to the conference.

One of the striking things this morning was looking at the newspaper clips and finding that the Secretary of Health and Human Services of the United States of America was booed off the stage. When you look at that, you ask yourself, why is it that we, the strongest, the most wealthy, the most advanced, the most scientifically creative country in the world is booed off the stage of an international conference on a world plague?

I think that it is important for us to think about what role we in this country have played. We have not taken our rightful leadership. There has not been an international conference in the United States since this Congress passed the Helms-Burton amendment some years ago, which excluded from this country anybody who has AIDS. If you have AIDS, you are not supposed to be able to get into this country.

Now, the statement we made to the world with that particular amendment from this Congress was that somehow coming in here you are bringing something that is not already here. AIDS is in this country. As we have already heard from previous speakers, like my friend from North Carolina, it is the leading cause of death among young black men in this country, and it is a leading illness among Hispanic women in this country.

We in this country have a problem that we have not dealt with. This Congress has not put money into the kind

of prevention and education programs that we ought to be doing for young people in this country. But that statement of the Helms-Burton amendment said to the world, you have got the problem, do not bring it over here. Clearly, this was not looking at our own position.

Now, the reason that conference in Barcelona was so important is that it is starting to talk about more and more advances of treatment and more and more complicated illnesses being found. There is all kinds of research there, but one must not lose sight of the fact that education and prevention still are the best hope for the world. We can have retroviral therapy, and we want that, and we should push the drug companies, and we should do everything possible, but administering those drugs and monitoring them, and it is as somebody described it, savage therapy. It is tough treatment. It is not an easy regimen. It has only so much effectiveness.

The real thing we have to get is people educated and aware of their own status. That is not expensive. If we would spend the money for the diagnostic tools that we have available and developed in this United States by USAID, we could make it possible for everyone to know their status. So at least they would know whether or not they were passing it on to their partner. But we do not put our money where our mouth is.

We say we want to do things for the world. We go and we make speeches, we put up a little bit of money, and then we double-count it so it looks like more. But the fact is, the United States is not putting up their fair share. Kofi Annan asked for an enormous contribution, said how much would be necessary, and the United States put up a pitiful amount.

Our contribution is something like 0.1 percent of our gross domestic product. The Norwegians, the Swedes, the Danes, the Dutch put up 0.2, 0.3 percent. Why can these little countries do that and we, the country with all the resources in the world, not put the money into the Global AIDS Fund that Kofi Annan has set up, or through our USAID? Or there are many ways in which we could put that money out there, but it requires a commitment.

Now, thanks to the work of people like the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILENDER-MCDONALD) and other Members of the Congress, the devastation that is occurring in Africa is now much better understood than it was 10 years ago.

I remember in 1991 having lunch with the President of Zambia, Mr. Kaunda, who said, what will I do with 500,000 orphans? Today, we are dealing with those orphans worldwide. And if we do not do something about it, it will not be 500,000, it will be millions and millions and millions of orphans. We must do more.

HIV AND AIDS IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the outstanding work that she has done in her tireless efforts to bring to the attention of America, the Congress, and the world the need for us to do much more as relates to the HIV and AIDS pandemic; and also the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), a physician, who also has been spearheading this. Let me commend them for attending the 14th International Conference on AIDS where the question of HIV and AIDS, of course, was the center of discussion.

It has been indicated that AIDS will kill at least 68 million people by 2020 unless rich nations invest far more in global prevention, says a report that was released last week. It is now clear to me that we have only seen the beginning of the worst epidemic in human history, says Peter Piot, Director of the joint United Nations program for HIV and AIDS, UNAIDS. He said that the disease will not only destabilize Africa but it will affect economic and political stability worldwide, particularly when the epidemic begins to peak in the most populated countries, such as China, India, and Russia.

The UNAIDS update, released ahead of the planned meeting that started on July 7 in Barcelona, indicates the number will grow to 40 million people worldwide, there has been a jump of 6 million cases, new cases, in 2 years, and that the infection rate continues to steadily rise in India, China, Russia, and Eastern Europe.

So we have a very, very serious situation. This terrorism is far more deadly than anything we could ever imagine. As we have indicated, the numbers are staggering, and AIDS is ripping through every continent destroying everything in its path. But let me concentrate a bit on Africa.

Botswana is currently experiencing the worst of the pandemic, with over 30 percent of its population affected. South Africa has also been hard hit. It is estimated that one out of three adults are infected. We have seen, to date, with President Mbeki, that there currently is really no national agenda to deal with the problem. We have seen statistics from Zimbabwe which say that 35 percent of that population has been infected with HIV and AIDS.

In many instances, the largest number of victims are from the public service sector: teachers, civil servants. So we can imagine what that will mean for most of the developed world when we are losing the leaders in those countries, with 14 percent of the teachers in South Africa infected. The rate is expected to increase to 30 percent in 10 years. So we have a very, very serious problem.

What we need to do, though, is to increase the amount of funds that are available. On the eve of the G8 meeting, President Bush announced a new initiative to address the pandemic through a pledge of an additional \$500 million over 3 years to help prevent mother-to-child transmission in parts of Africa and the Caribbean. As little as a single dose of medication to mother and child at birth is reported to prevent transmission 50 percent of the time.

While this is a positive step, it does not address the problem itself. The disease many times is transmitted through sexual activity, but this initiative focuses on the least politically sensitive aspect of care and treatment. U.S. AIDS programs, through the Agency for International Development, focus on education and do not offer treatment. Fewer than 2 percent of the people living with AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa have access to antiretroviral drugs that are saving lives and improving the quality of life for those who are fortunate enough to receive them.

So focusing primarily on the innocent newborns, Bush's pledge leaves out women and children and communities and families. So I urge that we push and stress that the U.S. House of Representatives step up to the plate and offer additional funding.

BARCELONA CONFERENCE ON HIV-AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I stand here, along with my colleagues, to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership on the issue of the AIDS pandemic internationally. My colleague already read the declaration from the Barcelona conference. I am going to read the whereas clauses, because I think they set forth specifically the status of this AIDS pandemic internationally.

"Whereas every single day AIDS claims 8,500 lives, or the equivalent of three World Trade Center disasters daily;

Whereas by December 2001, 40 million people were living with HIV-AIDS, and by 2005 an estimated 100 million will be infected;

Whereas more than 40 million children, most of them in developing nations, will be orphaned by AIDS by 2010;

Whereas the World Health Organization this year has stated that the antiretroviral treatment is medically essential and has issued specific treatment guidelines, monitoring standards, and regimen recommendations;

Whereas those on treatment represent less than 2 percent of all those infected with HIV because such treatment is almost completely unavailable in developing nations;

□ 1730

Whereas, over 500 nongovernmental organizations globally have endorsed the Barcelona March for Life, which demands treatment access to at least 2 million people in the developing world by the time of the 2004 International Conference on AIDS in Bangkok;

Whereas these organizations represent AIDS activists from Africa, Asia and the Pacific Islands, Australia, Europe, Central and South America, and North America, therefore, we declare as activists pledged to life for all persons with HIV/AIDS that we are committed to the following goals, which the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has set forth.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to represent the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) at World AIDS Day in Seattle 2 years ago during the WTO, and it was my pleasure to sit on her behalf. What was most interesting to me was the fact that an epidemiologist came and testified before the organization that there were hundreds and thousands of grandparents raising grandchildren because the parents of these children have been infected with the HIV/AIDS virus and, therefore, were unable to take care of their own children. So grandparents are taking care of as many as 25 of their grandchildren.

I think we need to pay attention to, as the United States of America, and when we start thinking about the companies and corporations that are doing business in these developing countries, that they will not have available to them the workers to do the work in these countries. We need to pay attention to the HIV/AIDS virus and pay attention not only in developing countries, but in our own Nation.

In the United States, 950,000 have been diagnosed with AIDS. African Americans make up 13 percent of the total U.S. population, but 54 percent of the new infections, 82 percent of the women who are newly infected with HIV/AIDS are African American and Latino.

The time is up for us to sit back and believe the HIV/AIDS virus is affecting people other than Americans and we can just think about it being in another country and not deal with the issue.

I stand here in support of the Barcelona Declaration. I stand here in support of it on behalf of all the people of the world, but particularly on behalf of the people of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, and I salute the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her work in this area.

PRESIDENT BUSH REFUSES TO SUPPORT REAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, President Bush

gave a major speech on his administration's plan to curb executive greed and corporate misgovernance in America.

Why was the President's speech so poorly received? Why did the markets drop by several hundred points in the 2 days following the speech? Why did so many Wall Street workers who attended the speech ask, How much of this speech was politics, and how much of it is about real change?

Because despite his calls for corporate America to clean its act, President Bush, at the behest of his corporate sponsors, his major contributors, his political base, his political friends, continues to oppose real reform on Capitol Hill. He has refused to support pension and accounting reform and takes millions of dollars from the securities and accounting professions. He will not support legislation to halt offshore tax avoidance, while receiving contributions from many major companies who have moved offshore to avoid paying those taxes. His budget severely underfunds the Securities and Exchange Commission.

To make matters worse, the President has pushed to turn the public program of Medicare over to the health insurance industry and to HMOs, again while receiving millions of dollars from that health industry for his campaign and for Republican campaigns in the House and Senate.

The President also advocates turning Social Security over to the same Wall Street banks that advised American investors to buy WorldCom, Enron, Adelphia, and Bristol-Myers, and all those others companies over the last few years, while their analysts have privately ridiculed these companies and investors.

More recently, the President endorsed a prescription drug plan that would be administered by the health insurance industry and would make no provision for dealing with the skyrocketing prices American seniors pay for prescription drugs, simply because the President and Republican leaders in this Congress do not want to upset the prescription drug industry.

Apparently, the President has been convinced by the brand-name drug industry that prices simply are not a problem. The plan would undercut seniors' purchasing power and enable the drug industry to sustain its outrageous drug prices by permitting the continued abuse and manipulation of drug patent laws. Three weeks ago in the Committee on Energy and Commerce as we were marking up the drug bill, the chairman notified us that we would be quitting at 5 p.m., even though we had 20 more hours of work to do, because all of the Republican Members trooped off to a \$30 million fundraiser headlined by President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, and underwritten by the prescription drug industry.

The Chair of this fundraiser was the CEO of Glaxo, a British drug company which donated \$250,000 to that event. The next day when we returned to busi-

ness and our committee continued its markup on the prescription drug bill, amendment after amendment after amendment that was pro consumer was defeated because the drug companies wanted those amendments defeated.

The insurance industry has written legislation for the White House and the Republican leadership on Medicare privatization. The chemical industry has written legislation for the Republican leadership and the White House on environmental policy. The oil industry has written for Republican leadership and the White House legislation on energy. Wall Street has written for the White House and Republican leadership legislation on privatizing Social Security; and the prescription drug industry has written legislation dealing with pharmaceuticals for the White House and Republican leadership.

Coincidentally, Mr. Speaker, the most recent example of the President taking industry's side comes from today's headlines and also concerns prescription drugs. To avoid more questions about corporate accountability, President Bush left town today to give a speech in Minnesota on prescription drugs, and of course to headline a Republican fundraiser, his 34th this year, while we fight the war on terrorism.

The speech is timed to coincide with the release of an administration report, which conveniently concludes that the drug industry, America's most profitable industry year after year after year over the last 20 years, and an industry which enjoys the lowest tax rate of any industry year after year, his report concludes that the drug industry will be harmed by additional regulatory burdens, by lower prices imposed in part by this Congress.

Democrats are more concerned about the burden on seniors and their families who are being gouged by the predatory pricing of the pharmaceutical industry. That is why we support a direct prescription drug benefit with guaranteed coverage inside Medicare, not an insurance policy plan written by the drug industry.

Mr. Speaker, when will the administration do work in the public interest rather than on corporate interests?

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that this new hour follows that last 5-minute presentation which was a perfectly classic example of partisan rhetoric aimed more to gain political favor than to shed light on an issue.

What we are going to do for the next hour is exactly the opposite, that is, my colleagues from the Committee on Energy and Commerce are going to talk about how we can, in bipartisan fashion, deal with the corporate malaise, the corporate scandals that have

rocked our country to make sure that American investors are in better shape and enjoy more confidence in the market in the future.

We are here to talk about the best way to ensure corporate accountability, restore investor confidence in our markets, and build a 21st-century model of corporate governance that will give us an honest, open, transparent and efficient marketplace.

Before I am joined by my other colleagues, I want to describe the challenges we in Congress, the administration, and the overwhelming number of honest men and women who run our country's publicly traded companies face in this effort. I want to begin by placing our work in the larger context of the remarkable events that have occurred in the executive suites of some of America's largest corporations and the unsettling erosion in corporate accountability.

What we have been witness to this year with the collapse of WorldCom, Adelphia Corporation, Tyco International, ImClone, Enron, and Global Crossing is almost beyond comprehension. Certainly the markets themselves remain confused. The Standards & Poor stock index is down 17 percent since the year began, and as *Business Week* reported, "The inability of investors to distinguish honest companies from dishonest ones have caused them to sit on the sidelines. They are not buying."

More disturbing, however, is the behavior of overseas investors. They are getting out. They are selling off their holdings and driving down the dollar, which has slipped 9 percent against the Euro since February.

Clearly we need in bipartisan fashion to take every reasonable and prudent step to restore confidence in our markets. But in doing that, we need to remember that this decline in the character of corporate governance did not occur overnight. What we are now experiencing are the terrible costs of the 1990s corporate culture that placed too high a premium on the effort to do well at the expense of doing what is right.

Look at the evidence. While there will probably be nearly 250 corporate earnings restatements this year, the number has been mounting since the mid-1990s. For example, while there were 157 financial restatements last year, there were nearly 200 in 1999, and 100 in 1998. The cost to investors has been high. It is estimated in a just-released study that these restatements resulted in total market value losses of \$31.2 billion in 2000, but 1998 and 1999 restatements which accounted for market value losses of roughly \$18 billion and \$24 billion respectively were disturbing as well.

This brings me to a remark of one of our witnesses, Professor Bala Dharan of Rice University. He made it 2 weeks ago at our first hearing on the reform of the Financial Standards Accounting Board. When I asked if perhaps the boards of directors of our largest com-

panies were too busy at the shrimp bowl to pay attention to their duties, his reply was that they were either "snoring or ignoring."

Then he went on to make what I believe was a chilling and sobering observation. Commenting on the events that led to the unraveling of firms like WorldCom, Tyco, and Enron he said, "What is going on is that this is a case that involves an enormous number of people, and that is why I refer to them as financial engineering rather than just accounting. In order to do this, you also have to have the compliance of lawyers and investment bankers from the outside."

He then concluded, "We are witnessing a comprehensive approach to financial engineering that has been going on for the last 5-10 years."

This is what we are confronting in our markets and in too many executive suites, a complex web of self-dealing and private arrangements which were conceived in a culture poisoned by a downward spiral in corporate ethics and management character.

This spectacular explosion of the Enron supernova brought all this to light in a dramatic fashion, but it did not happen overnight, nor can we hope to restore the integrity of our markets and the character of the men and women who run America's publicly traded companies without a long-term commitment to comprehensive reform in a wide array of areas.

We believe that our Republican approach both in the Congress and the White House embraces nearly all of the steps needed to accomplish our goal. We also believe that there is broad agreement by the members of both parties on nearly all the critical issues that need to be addressed.

I would be remiss if I did not mention that there will be a temptation in this political year to play up partisan differences by Members on both sides of the aisle. The heated rhetoric of the past few days has convinced me, and no doubt many others, that there are some in this body who are more interested in acquiring political capital than in protecting the financial capital of America's investors.

As we are a political body, nobody should be surprised at this. But I am asking my colleagues to remember this: what we are dealing with is very large, and it is about so much more than money or crime or greed, although there has been plenty of that. We must restore investor confidence and market integrity in the most potent weapon in democracy's arsenal, free markets directed by a free people. This is a sobering task, and my hope is that each of us will bring the level of seriousness and cooperation to it that allows us to achieve our common goal.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

I have to say in the 8 years I have been here, at no time has it been more painful for me to listen to partisan rhetoric associated with an issue than has been the case in this debate. The issue of corporate governance is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue; it is not the fault of one administration or another. Certainly the problems arose and occurred during the previous administration, but I do not blame the previous administration, any more than I blame this administration.

We will not solve these problems, we will not address these problems proactively and effectively, by pointing fingers at each other and trying to accuse each other and make political hay out of a situation that demands calm, pragmatic and cooperative work on the part of everybody in this body to come up with a solution that restores confidence and creates growth and begins the process of growth again in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the work that has been done by our President and the speech that he made earlier this week in New York City. I want to pay particular attention to the exhaustive hearings that have been held by both the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection over the past 6 months.

Some of these hearings were held well before the crisis erupted to the point where it is today and may have in their content given regulators significant assistance and information and a prodding, quite honestly, to move forward and to make changes that may be way overdue.

Let me just say from the outset that the problem we face in corporate America is that there are a few very bad apples that have broken the law, and, as our distinguished committee chairman has said on a number of different occasions, these individuals should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law and they should be sent to jail, just like any other common criminal in this country. There is no difference between stealing money from investors and robbing a bank and stealing money or shoplifting in a store, except it is more serious, and they ought to go to jail for it.

Secondly, as I alluded to in the beginning of my comments, the solution to this problem should be bipartisan, bipartisan. The more we talk about whether it is a Republican's fault or a Democrat's fault, the harder it is going to be to come to a good, quick, effective solution, and the only people who are going to suffer from that are going to be consumers, investors, retirees, parents and families. So it is time we got together and cut out this partisan discussion.

Thirdly, I think we should direct regulators to move expeditiously to clean up the problems that we face and provide recommendations, which we have done in two pieces of legislation, one

that was marked up by the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection yesterday and another one passed earlier by the committee.

But what we should not do, in my opinion, is put into statute what should be done by regulators, because when you place ideas into statute, they are there forever, effectively, for a long time, and conditions in the financial world change and you have to have flexibility to deal with problems as they arise and change things over time. We run the risk by forcing regulators to do things that we want or by passing laws that set regulations in statute that we will create problems in the economy that were unintended.

Thirdly, we should be very careful not to stifle capitalism in this country, that we should not stifle the ability of the hundreds of thousands of honest entrepreneurs in this country and hard-working Americans who are trying to make a go of it and are doing it honestly.

We do not want to turn every CPA in this country into a Federal bureaucrat. We do not want to have chief financial officers and executives answerable to the Federal Government instead of to their shareholders and to their boards of directors. We want to have a system of regulations in place that is flexible, accountable, transparent; no more, no less.

The fact is, we cannot in Congress legislate honesty. We never have and we never will. But we can work together as Republicans and Democrats to assure that the rule of law applies to all and that corporate America is held accountable. If we do this, we will get out of this problem quickly and we will look at a bright and prosperous period of economic growth in the years to come.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the man who has been leading us in all of these investigations, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GREENWOOD) for the extraordinary job he has done and the members of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the now many-month-long series of investigations beginning with the Enron scandal and the series of hearings we had, exposing what we found to be massive, in our opinion, fraud and massive cooking of the books at that corporation, and the subsequent investigations that are ongoing even today in the failure of other corporate managers and boards of directors which have led to much of what we see, the carnage on Wall Street and the loss of millions and billions of dollars, in fact, in investor funds over the last year or so.

Those hearings and those investigations began as we learned of the serious

problems at Enron. Our investigative staff, as you know, began working throughout over the Christmas holidays gathering information that was available to us. We uncovered the fact that Arthur Andersen employees were shredding documents, and we had to have hearings in advance of our hearings on Enron to expose that problem. That, as you know, has led to a Federal indictment and now a conviction.

We had to literally examine thousands and thousands of documents, and in those documents we found indeed the whistleblower memo that told us an awful lot about what had happened and what was going on at Enron that caused it to collapse and why, in fact, all the special partnerships and the outside special entities that were created were designed, not for economic reasons, but simply to hide debts and inflate income.

We have seen that replicated now in a number of different cases that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GREENWOOD) has already mentioned and that most of us know about now, including with the latest criminal investigation announced of Quest Communications and the collapse of WorldCom on the world stage.

The one thing that we have learned out of all of these hearings is that when greed is unchecked by the fear of discovery, a lot of bad things happen. I suppose it is a little bit like having a lot of great laws against bank robbing, but then leaving the doors open and telling the policeman to go home, and then being surprised when somebody robs the bank.

Banks get robbed and laws can be as strong as we want to make them, but we still need good policemen on the beat and still need good laws to ensure that vaults are secure at night and managers of banks take care of the money in the bank on behalf of those who put their trust and their confidence and money in those banks.

So is it true with corporate America. More and more Americans are invested now in publicly traded companies. More and more Americans, without even knowing it sometimes, have their pension funds invested in corporate America and public funds. More and more Americans directly now invest over the Internet and trade stocks every day in the stock market. More and more millions of Americans, in fact, are now owners of American corporations, instead of just the few who might have owned them in years past. So more and more millions of Americans have a great stake in the way corporate America behaves.

The notion that corporate governance in the cases of these massive failures has now let these Americans down and that workers have been put out of their jobs and that pension funds have been devastated, not simply at the companies where those workers have their pension funds, but all the pension funds around America that were invested in these companies, the notion

that that is happening in America at a time when we should have indeed a strong protective system at the SEC, we should have indeed strong enforcement of our laws, we should have boards of directors who carefully are representing the interests of those millions of American owners of American corporations, the notion that that could happen has literally shaken, I think, American investor confidence in this system, and we need to restore it quickly.

Now let me say something, Mr. Speaker, that I think needs to get said. The reason why our committee has been so passionate about what we have found and what we are learning about the failures in corporate America is that our committee is the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It is the oldest committee in this Congress. It is the only one mentioned in the United States Constitution.

Our Committee on Interstate Commerce has been for many, many years the committee that literally bears responsibility for making sure that the commerce of our country is conducted properly, that the economy of our country is strong, that its laws and regulations and the institutions that guide our economy are well-funded and operate well. To the extent this is happening on our watch, we have a responsibility to fix what is wrong and to make better laws and regulations to make sure it does not happen again.

But it also offends us more than anyone else. As defenders of the free market system, as people who have fought to make sure that free enterprise and the capital markets were allowed to flourish in America, as opposed to those who would like to strangle them with regulations and socialize many conditions in this country, we are the most offended when bad players, when corporate criminals mess it up for all the good players in this country, the thousands upon thousands of small business corporations and medium-sized corporations and even the large corporations in this country who do it right.

That is why we become so offended when some in the accounting industry violate their trust with so-called aggressive accounting and cook the books in a sense in collaboration with crooked executives to make it look like the companies are doing better than they should be, and then to take off with the stock and to sell it, where the pension holders cannot sell their stock, or while the rest of America who is invested in the company finds out they have lost so much of their savings.

That is why we are so passionately angry about what has occurred and why our committee is so desperate to get all the facts and to understand what is wrong with this system and to fix it so it does not happen again.

We are engaged today at our committee level in an investigation of 13 companies who have seen similar failure like Enron, who have gone through

some efforts to either hide debt or inflate income beyond that which really existed, some effort to convince investors they were doing a lot better than they really were, and have now collapsed, and we have seen the loss of millions and billions of dollars to those investors.

We are investigating those 13 companies right now and looking particularly at the boards of directors. We are very interested in knowing who those boards of directors were, how were they selected. Were they selected to represent the interests of the investors, or were they selected to represent the interests of the managers? Were they selected to be the CEO's men and women on the board of directors, or were they selected to represent the interests of the real owners of the corporation, the American investors who put their hard-earned dollars into a belief that those companies were being run properly?

It shocked us in the Enron hearings to see how little the boards of director members who testified before our committee knew about what was going on, how much they took at faith the statements of the executives in that company that everything was okay and they were doing everything correctly and they should not ask any hard questions. It shocked us at how little the audit committees had done in reviewing those special partnerships in those entities created to hide debts and inflate income. It shocked us to think that those people who were serving on some of the most prestigious boards in America knew so little about what was really going on in their corporations, or at least claimed to.

So we are going after that issue. We are going to find out what is happening in the boardrooms of America.

There is some good news out of all of this. The good news in the face of all this carnage is that changes are occurring in corporate boardrooms of America. CEOs no longer have a friendly visit to their boards, they tell me. Boards are beginning to ask tougher questions. CEOs are having to answer the tough, hard questions about how their accounting is done. Accounting firms are beginning to have to answer hard questions by the audit committees and the finance committees of boards across America.

There is a sea change going on. On Wall Street, reforms are being recommended to separate those analysts who work for the investment houses, to separate them so people are not putting lipstick on ugly pigs and selling them to us as beauty queens.

□ 1800

We are beginning to see that change is being made at the SEC as they are recommending independent boards, and legislation is moving through Congress as a result of our hearings. Not only did this House, but the Senate now is taking up bills to deal with some of the issues of accounting misuse and abuses and to deal with the issues of independ-

ence of accounting and independence of corporate governance.

Just this week our committee produced a bill to reform the accounting standards at the FASB, the board under our jurisdiction that sets accounting standards for America. In addition, a committee of this House passed through this Congress a bill to protect the pension funds of America to make sure that corporate executives could not sell their stock while the pensioners were stuck holding theirs. That legislation is now in the Senate waiting for final action.

The bottom line is, we are beginning to see legislative action. We are beginning to see executive action, as the President himself has now issued an executive order. We are beginning to see reforms in corporate boardrooms across America and at the Wall Street offices in New York and around the country. We are beginning to see turnaround.

So the outrage that we have seen in our committee, the ugly picture we have seen in our committee of corporate misbehavior, corporate criminal conduct, is at least beginning to produce some good results. People are beginning to take it seriously. As my friends have said, the Justice Department and others are beginning to look seriously at indictments and, hopefully, convictions of those corporate criminals, and reforms are literally in the wind.

So it will take a little while for investors to really feel like things have changed, that they can put their money into an American corporation again and really believe that the boards of directors are going to represent them instead of someone else; who can really believe that corporate managers are going to be looking after their interests and not their own golden parachutes. Things are changing. The result of these hearings, the result of our ongoing investigations, I think, are going to build a better market for this country and beginning to have the investor confidence that really means something again.

But if anyone in this country owes an obligation to protect this free market system and the capital markets and how they are structured, a free market by which this American economy has led the world, it is those of us in Congress who serve on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who have been responsible for over 200 years of protecting the interstate commerce of this country. Our committee will continue to do its work, and we will do it in a bipartisan fashion. We will ask our friends on the other side of the aisle, as we have always done in our committee and who have joined us in our FASB reforms, to join us as we go through these reforms and investigations until all the truth is known and all the reforms are in. This is great work we do. I hope we do it well.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD)

and the members of his Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations for the incredible work they have done so far and, believe me, we have much work yet to do.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the full committee for his remarkable remarks.

I recognize and yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and I am glad to be here and commend him for his special order on this issue.

As the gentleman knows, we marked up in the subcommittee that I chair H.R. 5058, which is the Financial Accounting Standards Board Act, which was introduced and passed by bipartisan support out of my subcommittee, which attempts to bring some of these financial accounting standards up-to-date and modern.

Mr. Speaker, in the roaring 1990s, investors were all caught in a spiral of ever-increasing optimism about the outlook for economic growth and stock valuations. It seemed the increase in stock valuations would never end, but of course, it did end. History teaches us they always do. In 2000, the so-called Internet bubble burst, and many investors lost money, not only monies invested in an Internet company, but also investments in leading, established blue chip companies. All of us remember when Alan Greenspan aptly characterized the phenomena of the stock market as "irrational exuberance." All of us had sort of a special sense of spiraling optimism.

Unfortunately, something that even Alan Greenspan did not predict has happened. In the wake of the roaring 1990s, we have witnessed corporate failures, bankruptcies, earnings restatements at unprecedented levels. Established companies that may have been overvalued were expected to weather these difficult times as business slowed, but they did not. The culture of the 1990s created something far worse: the race to up the earnings at all costs. Hype, hype, hype.

Of course, the first to fall was Enron. Amid its ashes, we discovered a host of problems involving corporate governance, audit independence, accounting fraud, and accounting standards. It would have been easier to accept the collapse of Enron were it an aberration. That no longer, of course, appears to be the case, given the recent news of Tyco, Global Crossing, and WorldCom, just to name a few. There is one every week.

These failures have put a strain on market recovery. Investors do not trust financial statements and that undermines their trust of all companies, good or bad. To stabilize our markets, accounting and corporate governance systems must be improved. We on the Committee on Commerce are committed to do that. This committee will

do its part by acting on that which falls within our jurisdiction, which is accounting standards.

Now, the President just recently offered additional steps to stem the tide of investor mistrust of the capital markets. The markets themselves have taken significant steps in that direction, as seen in the new rules that have been proposed by the New York Stock Exchange. Of course, on the legislative front, the House has already passed legislation out of the Committee on Financial Services to reform the corporate governance and the audit system. The Senate, as we speak, is moving towards legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, all of these efforts have primarily been focused on corporate and auditor governance. I believe changes to accounting standards and the process of setting those standards is another critical component of complete reform. I think that in addition to procedural reforms addressing governance issues, we must also carefully study and address substantive reform, which means that the content of the GAAP principles of accounting must be reexamined in light of Enron-like accounting scandals.

So that is why our bill, H.R. 5058, which passed out of my subcommittee, the Financial Accounting Standards Board Act, is just an important first step for improving the transparency and reliability of financial accounting.

Now, I thought I would review just briefly what the bill does. The bill does simply four main things. First, it gives FASB standards Federal recognition for the first time.

Second, it directs FASB to promulgate rules in areas in which our investigations have revealed current standards need improvement: specifically, off-balance sheet accounting, revenue recognition, and mark-to-market accounting.

Third, it requires FASB to promulgate a primary standard that must be used to ensure the application of accounting rules complies with principles of transparency and comprehensibility. This will go a long way to preventing the abuse of accounting standards like those that have been revealed in the oversight committee investigations, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is involved in with Enron and Global Crossing.

Fourth and finally, the bill requires the GAO and FASB to report on FASB's compliance with the act and other issues relevant to the standard-setting process.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this was within our jurisdiction and this is the only thing that we could attack. I had an amendment in the bill which would also create a blue ribbon commission to study accounting standards and standard-setting processes. Specifically, the commission will evaluate FASB's 30-year record, evaluate the role of accounting standards, how they played in recent accounting failures, and explore alternative standard-set-

ting mechanisms. This commission is not involved with governance. It is all involved with accounting standards and the standard-setting process. The commission, of course, will then present its findings and recommendations to our full committee.

I would like to just mention one of the witnesses that we had in our hearing dealing with financial accounting standards, a Professor Coffee, who is an expert; and he testified that "Reasonable people can disagree about the appropriate reforms that are needed to improve the regulation of the accounting profession and, not surprisingly, quite different proposals are currently pending in the House and Senate. But while reasonable, and sometimes even heated, disagreement is possible on many questions, there should be consensus on one fundamental point: our current substantive system of accounting principles, rule-based and hyper-technical, has shown itself to be vulnerable to exploitation by those willing to game the system."

So I think our passage of H.R. 5058 will move forward, and when it moves to the full committee in the House and hopefully, to the conference, we will be able to add, expand, and make it more comprehensive.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to conclude by bringing to the attention of my colleagues some comments from the former president of Arthur Andersen, who gave an editorial in the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Berardino. He was managing partner and CEO of Andersen and, of course, we know Andersen was found by the Justice Department to be guilty of shredding documents. But sometimes when you go to somebody who has seen the failure intimately they can sometimes bring to bear some very important points, so I would share with my colleagues some of his points.

He admits we need to rethink some of our accounting standards. Heaven knows, the Tax Code has gotten so complex. Likewise, our accounting standards have gotten complex and technical. Enron used sophisticated financing vehicles known as special purpose entities and other off-balance-sheet structures to hide debt, and they did it in such a way that no one could even understand them. In fact, the management's discussion and analysis in their profit and loss statement was 16 pages of footnotes. That was in its 2000 annual report.

Now, some of them, institutional investors as well as sophisticated investors, they all studied these 16 pages. Some sold short and made profits, but others who were also sophisticated analysts and fund managers said, well, I may be confused, but they went ahead and bought the shares anyway of Enron, and, of course, they lost money.

So if these people, institutional investors, fund managers, cannot understand these 16 pages of footnotes, how can the common investor understand them? We need to change that. We need to fix this problem. We cannot main-

tain trust in our capital markets with a financial reporting system that delivers volumes and volumes of complex information about what happened in the past, but leaves some investors with limited understanding of what is happening in the present and, more importantly, what is likely to occur in the future.

So the current financial reporting system has to be changed, and I would say to my colleagues, it was developed in the 1930s. It was developed for the Industrial Age. That was during times when assets were very tangible and everybody understood them. The investors who were involved at that time were very sophisticated, but they were few. There were no derivatives, the derivatives at Enron and all of these organizations used to hedge their bets; none of that was happening in the 1930s. There was no structured off-balance-sheet financing, no instant stock quotes or mutual funds, no First Call estimates and, of course, there was no Lou Dobbs on CNBC.

So we need to move quickly here in Congress to establish and rethink our accounting standards and to modernize them, because I think the public is right, they have lost credibility, and this can be changed.

The other area that I would like to discuss is the patchwork of regulatory environment we have here. We have an alphabet soup of institutions, from the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants to the Securities and Exchange Commission to the Auditing Standards Boards to the Emerging Issues Task Force to the Financial Accounting Standards Board, FASB, to the Public Oversight Board. All of these have important roles in our profession, in the accounting profession, of regulation, and they are made up of very smart, very diligent, competent people.

But the problem, I submit, is all of these alphabetized, this alphabet soup of institutions, there are too many of them, there are too many cross-purposes. Somehow we need to bring them all together so they are focused better. And so the process, the whole process of oversight of all of these different institutions I talked about, needs to be redesigned. I do not think we should eliminate them, but I think somehow we have to get them more flexible and more suitable for the modern world.

□ 1815

Lastly, I would say improving accountability across our capital system. Two years ago, scores of new-economy companies soared. They came out of nowhere. Of course, they had public offerings, initial public offerings, and they went up and they collapsed in dust. A lot of investors questioned their business model and prospects. The dot-com bubble cost investors trillions of dollars.

So I think if we come together in a bipartisan fashion and look how to increase the market's integrity, I think

we can do it. I think some of the comments from the former managing partner and CEO of Andersen are some ideas we should think about, and I think some of the things we have started in my bill, H.R. 5058, that came out of my subcommittee, is another good start for reforming the accounting standards in this country. I look forward to continuing this process.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contributions in this Special Order, as well as his very excellent contributions in the leadership of his subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, to underscore the importance of this issue, I would like to make a few more remarks.

America's place in the world, our leadership place in the world, is derived in many respects from the character of our people. It is derived in large measure from the nature and the beauty of our Constitution; but it is also derived in no small manner from our wealth, from our economy, the strength of our economy.

Our wealth as a Nation is the wealth that produced the military apparatus that fought wars and preserved democracy, that overcame Communism, that just liberated Afghanistan. Our wealth as a Nation is the wealth that is used to pull people from poverty into middle-class luxuries. Our wealth as a Nation is the wealth that enables us to find cures for diseases.

Also, our wealth is derived from our marketplace. Our wealth is derived because our marketplace is extraordinary in its ability to allow Americans to use their savings, and we are not good at savings in this country. Compared to the rest of the world, we save very little. But our marketplace is so efficient that the relatively meager savings of America can be used in the marketplace so that investment goes to the most productive companies and to the brightest ideas. That has enabled us to create a level of productivity that is unrivaled in the world, even by those nations that save far more money than we do, because we have this efficient market.

Now, the efficiency of that market is completely dependent upon the notion that investors can, on a regular basis, look at the independently audited financial statements of companies and make a decision about where they want to make their investments.

They want to make their investments in companies that are doing well, that are showing progress, that are showing profit, that are showing promise. They get to make a decision. They get to decide if they want to take a lot of risk in the marketplace. If they think they have analyzed a company and it has a promising product, if it has not made it yet, but may emerge and may solve a problem in this country; or they may take a high risk; or they may decide to take a little bit of risk and invest more modestly. But they do that based on their ability to

trust the audited financial statements that these companies put out pursuant to law.

Now, what has happened? What has created this problem? What has created this problem is that the companies that we have seen in the headlines of America's newspapers are companies who refused to abide by the simple premise that they have a responsibility to issue audited financial statements that can be believed.

They have decided to do what is called "managing revenues," not just reporting their revenues, not just saying to their auditing committee, how much money did we make this year, what were our revenues, but saying to their auditors and accountants, how can we boost those revenues above what they really were? How can we phony up the numbers?

Why did they do this? They did this because, particularly in a market which was heavily invested and experiencing this bubble, they did it because they knew if their revenues began to fall, if they did not meet expectations, investors might take their money and go elsewhere. That is one reason they did it.

Another reason they did it in some of the worst cases is because corporate executives had stock options, and they knew if they could push the revenues up way beyond where they really were, if they could report revenues way beyond the actual revenues of the company, that the stock prices would follow, and then they could cash out, sell their stock at a very high price, and yet leave a company or leave the rest of the investors with a company that really was a phony company and a false company and a company that did not have the value that they had reported in their own financial statements.

This is not the first time that this kind of thing has happened in our history. We went through a savings and loan debacle which cost the American taxpayers and investors billions of dollars. We went through problems with junk bonds.

I was reading a book over the last week called "Financial Shenanigans." There was a story, a true story, about a man whose business was vegetable oil. He was bringing in, or allegedly bringing in, boatloads of vegetable oil to this repository. He would impress his investors with all of the vegetable oil that he had accumulated; and they were investing in this product, in this market that he had.

What they did not know was that he had a vast system of underground piping that pumped water into the tanks. The vegetable oil was just a thin veneer that sat on the top of the water. So the researchers and analysts and underwriters would come, and he would take the tops off of his tanks and say, Look how much vegetable oil I have, millions of gallons of vegetable oil, when in fact it was all a phony scheme.

This is not unlike what we have seen in the marketplace here. The kind of

reforms that we take here in a bipartisan fashion are going to have to have the effect on this corporate greed that ultimately happened when they let the water out of the tanks on this gentleman's vegetable oil barrels.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to cite another example of how the gentleman's committee has worked on a problem in America that was awful, the Firestone tire failure problem just last year.

When the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce did the deep investigations of Firestone and followed through in the current cycle of Congress, through to a point where not only did Firestone itself begin to fix its own problems, but it is reestablishing its name, it is beginning to hire back its people, its products are beginning to find their way back into the marketplace with confidence again; and it has now realized that it cannot have a defective product out there.

It is doing much better today, I should report to the American public; but we in Congress, after those very extensive hearings, those awful hearings where we looked at so many people who had died on the highway because of the failure of tires on the traveling roads of our country, we in Congress acted swiftly. We amended for the first time in 30 years the highway safety laws of our country. NHTSA, our National Highway Safety Administration, was empowered to gather much more information about the safety of tires. It was empowered to do much deeper testing. It was empowered to require the companies to build better tires and to test them more efficiently and effectively.

It is now going through a rulemaking that is going to give all of us a chance to know, in the new automobiles we buy, just what our tire pressure looks like and whether or not we are losing tire pressure so our tires become more dangerous again. The work the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Commerce produced is now producing stronger regulations, legislation which mandated stronger tires, safer automobiles; and therefore we are saving lives because of what we did with that extensive investigation and the subsequent legislation.

We are in the same position here, except the lives we are trying to save are the financial lives of the citizens of our country; the financial life of Wall Street, to try to restore its confidence again; the financial life of corporations that are suffering.

I bleed today for the workers at Enron. I bleed for the good accountants who worked for Arthur Andersen who have lost their jobs, who have seen their company come under such disastrous publicity and indictment and conviction for what occurred in the

shredding. I bleed for the folks at WorldCom today, who are suffering through layoffs because their corporate executives participated in an apparent scheme to cook the books, and now their company is on the verge of bankruptcy.

We should bleed for those workers, but we also bleed for the American public who invested in those companies and who trusted them.

So what is the work product we have to come out with? We have to come out with a work product that literally strengthens our regulations, strengthens our laws, strengthens the enforcement agencies, but also does something the President called upon, and that is reinstills in corporate America, in those companies who may have lost their way, an understanding that character counts and that truth-telling is important. When they sign on the dotted line what the value of their company is, it should be a true value.

It says to accountants, when they go and audit the books, they ought to do a fair auditing. They ought not hide debt and inflate income, and they ought to give people the truth about how well their corporation is doing.

The good news is that most American corporations, the vast majority of American corporations, are not experiencing these problems. They have good boards and good managers, and the American public can have faith in them. But for those who have violated the trust of the American investors and the laws of our land, there are laws to punish them today, without us passing a single new law. There is justice coming, and there is reform in the wind.

Again, I think the Firestone story tells the truth about this situation. When we shed light on the problem honestly, faithfully, get all the facts on the table, put the witnesses in front of the American public, let them tell their stories, when we do that, Congress acts, the regulatory agencies act, and the American public responds.

Corporate America is waking up, I believe, to their responsibilities. I believe they are going to learn out of this horrible experience how important it is to keep, not just to build and to have, but to keep the trust of the folks who put their money into those corporations; who fund them, essentially, in their businesses through their investments and their pensions and 401(k)s, and the daily buying and selling of stock in our major markets.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman for the great work that the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has done. The Committee on Financial Services, led by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), is doing a good job; and the combination of that and the work the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) is doing in the Committee on Education and the Workforce on pension reform, I think that work together with what the Senate will do on the Sarbanes bill and what may

happen yet on our FASB legislation and other bills that may make it through in terms of strengthening the criminal penalties against bad behavior.

All that work will complement, I hope, the good work that is going on in corporate America now to clean up their act, and the good work that is going on in the accounting field to make sure that aggressive accounting is a thing of the past and that honest accounting is the way of the future.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman, for joining us again on this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a fear, a nervousness, that if we continued these investigations, if we brought these corporate moguls before our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, that somehow that would rock the markets and it would shake the confidence of the investors and make things worse instead of better.

We thought long and hard about that in our subcommittee, but we decided to continue on with our investigations and to continue to pursue these matters because we cannot, we cannot get the reforms that are required to protect the investor in this country until we lance the boil. We have to pick the scab. We have to open the wound, look at it, allow it to be seen by the American people, to show the American people that the United States Congress understands that this cannot stand and it will not stand, and that we will move to make reforms.

There are those who want to do too little. I think, frankly, some of the most conservative Members of the Congress want to do too little. They are afraid that these reforms are too much of an invasion into the private sector. They are not.

The marketplace of this country that drives our economy, that provides our wealth and provides our greatness, does not spring up like Topsy. It is the result of the laws and the regulations that we impose on the marketplace to keep it honest, to maintain its integrity so that investors can make smart decisions, so money can move efficiently to smart ideas and efficient companies and products, and make us wealthy as a result.

There are those who would do too much. There are those who would create a new Department of Auditing and make sure that every auditor in every company was a Federal employee. That would be bureaucratic and costly and invasive and wrong.

So we do have to find the middle way. We do have to find that which separates the most liberal Members of Congress from the most conservative Members of Congress, and I think we are well on our way.

I think the legislation that we passed in this House in April, the bill of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), was the middle way. I think what Mr. SARBANES did yesterday with 100 percent

support in the Senate represents the middle way. I think the President's bold remarks of 2 days ago were right on and illustrated the things that the executive branch particularly needs to do to bring us these reforms.

The only thing we need to worry about now is what we began this Special Order with, and that is the fear of partisanship. If Members of Congress and if political consultants and if leaders in political parties decide that, rather than solve this problem, rather than do the things that we need to do in a bipartisan fashion to restore confidence in the marketplace, they want to exploit this issue, create fear among the American people, try to cast false blame on particular individuals in the Congress or in the White House or elsewhere, then we will fail.

□ 1830

Then we will fail to meet our obligation to the American people and solve this problem. When this Congress, the 107th Congress of this country's history, concludes its work at the end of this year, I think two things must occur. We must be able, as we wish each other well for the holidays, clap each other on the back and say I think, number one, we have done everything we could in a bipartisan fashion to win the war on terrorism and provide security for America's people, and, secondly, we must say, as we leave this body for our Christmas holidays, I think that we have done everything we possibly could in bipartisan fashion to restore the confidence in the marketplace that this country so relies upon, that we did that in bipartisan fashion and that we can feel good about beginning a new year with growth in the economy and with security for the American people, not only physical security but economic security as well.

UNINSURED AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the next hour on the floor to discuss with my colleagues a grave situation in our country, the issue of the uninsured. I would like to set the stage on this topic before calling on a number of my colleagues who are equally committed and tenacious about fighting to bring this issue back to the forefront.

We are facing an extremely serious health crisis. I listen carefully to those that I represent in Congress. I hear from constituents every day who have lost their health insurance and have nowhere to turn. I hear from mothers and fathers who are afraid that their healthcare premiums will become so expensive that they simply cannot afford them any more. I hear from small business owners who are facing skyrocketing premium increases and may

not be able to offer health care coverage to their employees any more.

I believe that it is time once again to bring the issue of the uninsured and health care for all back to this House floor. I believe we need to act soon if we are going to save those families teetering on the edge of losing their health insurance, and I believe that it is unconscionable that in our country, the richest country on earth, that almost 40 million Americans have no health care coverage at all.

During 1999, about 15 percent of our population was uninsured. The Government defines being uninsured as being uninsured for a full year, but almost three out of every 10 Americans, more than 70 million people, were uninsured for at least a month over a 3-year period between 1993 and 1996. Although the uninsured population decreased slightly in 1999, the long-term trend has been growing of uninsured people. Without substantial restructuring of the opportunities for coverage, this trend is likely to continue. It is clear that the time to take action to solve this crisis is now.

I am sure many are aware of the recent reports issued by the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences regarding the uninsured in America. The Institute of Medicine is in the process of conducting a 3-year study on the uninsured. It has two major objectives. The first is that the study will assess and consolidate evidence about the health and economic consequences of being uninsured for persons without health insurance and their families, for health care systems and institutions, and for communities as a whole.

Secondly, the study will raise awareness and improve understanding for the public and the policymakers about the magnitude and nature of the consequences of lacking health insurance.

The 16-member committee on the consequences of the uninsured has already issued two reports and plans to issue four more by September of next year. The first report, *Coverage Matters: Insurance and Health Care*, concluded, and I should mention not surprisingly, that the high cost of health insurance along with public policies prevent tens of millions of Americans from obtaining health care coverage. The Institute on Medicine report also found that there are persistent misperceptions about the uninsured that present obstacles to addressing the issue constructively.

I would like to talk briefly about some of these misconceptions. First, many people may think that the number of uninsured in the United States is not large and that it might not have increased in the recent years. But despite a very modest dip at the end of the 1990s and in 2000 following an obviously extended period of economic prosperity and growth and low unemployment in our country, the number of uninsured people has grown over the long term.

According to the Institute of Medicine report, the number of uninsured people is greater than the combined population of Texas, Florida and Connecticut.

In 1992 Congress debated health care reform and a plan that would guarantee every American the health care they needed. That vision was never realized. And now we have more Americans who are uninsured than we did back in 1992.

The second misperception is that it is assumed that the people who are uninsured do not live in families that work. This is incorrect. According to the Institute on Medicine study, 80 percent of the uninsured children and adults live in working families. Included among the uninsured are parents who are working two, sometimes three, jobs just to make ends meet. But increasingly they work in sectors of our economy like small business, family farms, the service sector or maybe part-time employment that do not offer health insurance coverage to their employees or that require them to pay so much of it that they simply cannot afford it and do not take the coverage. Even families with two full-time wage earners have a one-in-ten chance of being uninsured.

The third myth is that it is improper to assume that the uninsured get adequate medical attention. A report by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured found that the uninsured receive less preventative care and are diagnosed at more advanced stages of diseases. The uninsured are less likely to see a doctor within any given year and have fewer visits annually, and they are less likely to have a regular source of medical care. Uninsured persons receive fewer preventative services and less care for chronic conditions than those who have health insurance. This ultimately adds to the costs because in many cases their medical conditions become much more serious, producing adverse outcomes that will need extensive follow-up care.

It is clear that the costs associated with the delay of care for the uninsured could be prevented if they had access to affordable coverage.

Another problem we are facing in our system is that the cost of health care services and insurance premiums have been steadily increasing and more employers and consumers are viewing coverage as prohibitively expensive. A gap in the ability to purchase health care coverage has been growing ever since the growth in the cost of health insurance has outpaced real income. This gap has added almost 1 million people to the ranks of the uninsured every year.

Now many employers absorbed premium increases during the economic boom of the 1990s, but they cannot be expected to continue this practice in our current economy. Many lower wage workers pass up on coverage because they cannot afford their share of the premium. On average, workers pay 14

percent of the costs of individual coverage and 27 percent of family coverage. Over the past 20 years, private sector employers have become less likely to cover part-time workers or new employees. And small businesses are faced with hurdles such as higher group premium rates and frequently do not offer coverage these days to their employees.

A business owner in my district could no longer provide health insurance to her employees because of the high costs of the premiums. Nancy Potter owned a bakery in New Glaris, Wisconsin for 25 years. Her health insurer left the region, and when she sought coverage from other companies, the quotes she received represented a 180 percent increase in premiums. She would have had to pay an additional \$50,000 each year to continue offering coverage. Unfortunately, she had to tell her 20 employees that she could no longer provide health insurance to them and their families. Even more devastating to her was the knowledge that one of her employees had recently been diagnosed with cancer and was undergoing treatment. This tragic state of affairs is not isolated and it is simply wrong.

On that note I would like to recognize one of my colleagues who has been a champion of the uninsured and of health care for all. We have worked very closely together and it is my privilege to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) for her leadership on health issues as well as on each and every issue that affects Americans on a daily basis, and also I want to just thank the gentlewoman for organizing this special order, because oftentimes health care remains under the radar, and I thank the gentlewoman for raising the level of awareness of this issue for all Americans, because for the wealthiest country in the world which claims liberty and justice for all, the fact that there are 44 million people without health insurance is really a shame and disgrace.

The fact that the bulk of the uninsured are low income and people of color is really no surprise. Although our Nation has a record low unemployment level, we still have one in six Americans who do not have health insurance. How fair and how just is that? Most Americans receive health insurance through their employers, but millions lack coverage because their employers do not offer insurance or simply cannot afford to pay it. Medicaid covers 40 million low income individuals, but millions more do not meet its limiting income and eligibility requirements because of really, quite frankly, savage welfare reform restrictions, leaving the most vulnerable uninsured.

Although State Children's Health Insurance Program is supposed to cover all low income children, 16 million low

income children still remain uninsured. Who are the uninsured? The uninsured are predominantly workers and their families, low income people, and oftentimes people of color. Fifty-six percent of the uninsured population is low income and nearly one in five of the uninsured are low income children.

Although people of color comprise only 34 percent of the population, over half of the Nation's uninsured are minorities. Twenty percent of those uninsured are African-Americans and 34 percent are Hispanic. In my own district we have one of the only organizations studying the disparities in the minority community. The Ethnic Health Institute is a community service of Summit Medical Center engaged in coordinating health education, research, health provider training and community outreach and awareness for the entire community with a very special focus on the underserved and community of color.

We must correct this imbalance in access which results in racial and ethnic disparities in care, and I am very proud that the Ethnic Health Institute is a wonderful example of an organization committed to this goal. People of color and the underserved bear a real disproportionate burden of mortality and morbidity rates across a wide range of health conditions. Mortality is a cruel indicator of health status and demonstrates how critical these disparities are for minorities. For African-Americans and Latinos, these disparities begin early in life and they persist. African-American infant mortality rates are more than double those of whites, 14 percent versus 6 percent; and the rate for Latinos is 9 percent compared to 6 percent for whites. The death rate for African-Americans is 55 percent higher for whites, with AIDS being the sixth leading cause of death for African American males.

I could go on and on with the multitude of statistics that clearly illustrates the stark disparities that exist for people of color. Yet the point remains that these disparities are the result of a lack of insurance, lack of access to health care, and, of course, still we are dealing with the economic divide.

Health insurance is important because it impacts health outcomes. Nearly 40 percent of the uninsured have no regular source of health care and use emergency care more due to avoiding higher costs of regular business. This situation creates an ongoing cycle of adults and children skipping routine checkups for common conditions, recommended tests, and treatments because of the financial burden resulting in serious illnesses that are, of course, more costly. The uninsured are more likely than those with insurance to be hospitalized for conditions that could have been avoided such as the flu.

I would ask my colleagues, are the people dying who have no access to health care, are they really important to you? Is it because mainly that they

are maybe children or poorer people of color or the working class that really blinds us all to their importance?

□ 1845

I do not believe that this is the message that any of us want to send, but that is the message that is being communicated.

The message that we must have then, however, is that universal health care, which provides high quality health care, should be provided without discrimination.

This challenges us as Americans to take another look at the fundamental role of government. We must do this if we are ever to achieve an equitable health care system, and I am totally convinced that sooner or later we must really come to grips with the fact that as long as the profit motive is central to our own health care system, and as long as health care remains big business, an industry, we will never have equal access to health care.

Universal health care is the only way we can provide equal access and fairness to our health care system. The uninsured are suffering, and if we do not acknowledge health care, sooner or later, as a basic human right, our society's most vulnerable will continue to grow.

Our Nation is the only industrialized nation that does not have a health insurance program for everyone and our health care system is truly failing. So we should make health care accessible. We should make health care affordable. We should really make health care a guarantee, and I want to once again thank my colleague from Wisconsin for continuing to beat the drum on health care and for calling us all down here tonight so we can ensure that our country knows that there are many Members of Congress who are going to insist that this be part of our legislative agenda.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would next like to recognize a physician Member of this House of Representatives, and a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and a champion for universal health care, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding to me. I am pleased that she has called this special order today. Of the lady from Wisconsin, from the day she ran, do not, they told her, do not run on universal health care. She ran on it, anyway, and she is here. That tells us something about what is out there in this country. The American people know that there is really no excuse for what is going on in this country, and my colleague from California (Ms. LEE) just gave us the statistics about the unfairness and the inadequacy of our health care system in this country.

I think the fact that we are the richest country in the world and that 72 percent of the uninsured are from a

family where somebody works full time, and, in fact, 13 million or 16 percent are in a family where two people work full-time and still do not have health insurance is simply a disgrace to this country.

I know there are people out there who say, well, it is going to cost so much money and we cannot handle it. Let me tell my colleagues what the real facts are, because a lot of what we will hear and see in advertisements is simply misleading.

Today, the United States spends \$1.2 trillion on health care. That averages out to \$4,350 a person. The average in the next 29 industrialized countries in the world, Sweden, Norway, France, Japan, Australia and so forth and so on, the average is \$1,760. We spend \$4,350. They spend an average of \$1,760.

Switzerland, which is the next one below us in amount of expenditure, only spends \$2,853, about 60 percent of what we spend, and none of those people have the problem we have in the United States that a person can be bankrupted by an illness or an injury at any time because we do not have health assurance of insurance.

We take care of people, oh, yes, we do. We take care of them in the emergency room, in the absolutely most inefficient way, when they have had a major catastrophe, no prevention, in an attempt to deal with it when it is a small problem. But when it is a catastrophe, they come into the emergency room. We see the strokes, the heart attacks. We see all of the things that could have been dealt with by medication for blood pressure or heart medication, a variety of other things.

Low birthweight children in this country. We spend a quarter of a million dollars on a child that is born at two or three pounds. If we had taken care of that young woman during the time the child was being developed, we would have had a normal child without the expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars. We could have done it for nickels and dimes.

So it is simply not that we do not have enough money in our health care system, it is that we spend it inefficiently and very wastefully.

A recent article in Health Affairs highlighted that most of the money for health care comes from, where do my colleagues suppose? Government spending. Either through direct expenditures of Medicare and Medicaid, but also through public employees' health benefits and tax breaks offered to businesses that give insurance.

That means that \$720 billion out of the \$1.2 trillion that we spend every year, remember that, \$1.2 trillion, and \$720 billion of it is tax-financed. That is about 60 percent. More than half is presently paid for by the government. \$213 billion comes from Medicare. That is about 18 percent of the spending. \$186 billion is for Medicaid, which is 15 percent of the spending. \$65 billion is spent on public employee benefits between Federal and State and local people, and then there is \$110 billion worth

of tax subsidies to businesses to provide health insurance for those companies that do it for their employees. If they do not, of course they do not get the benefit.

When we take that, that is over \$2,600 that we spend on average in this country from the government. The average, remember, in industrialized countries is only \$1,760. So we already spend more money in our country from the government than they spend in any country in the world.

So then the question we ask ourselves is, why, if we spend that much money and we still have forty some million people without insurance, how can this be? What is going on? We have the best technology in the world, the best physician training. Doctors come from all over the world to train here. We have the most advanced services in the world. Those are good things. So we have good things for our money, and then what do we pay for it? Well, we pay for the profit of a myriad of health care companies and two groups, I think, deserve special attention.

One is insurance companies. Every time there is an attempt to deal with a health insurance program for the country, we suddenly see the insurance companies throwing millions of dollars out there as they did when Mrs. CLINTON in 1993 and 1994 tried, they spent \$110 million advertising at the American people that you do not want the government to get into your health care. We are in health care. We are paying 60 percent of the bill right now.

The insurance companies get 15 percent or more for their overhead costs. Medicare, for example, the government program, gets 1 percent, 1 percent; insurance companies, 15 percent. So right there we have got heaps of dough. We have got way more than \$100 billion right there that we waste on insurance company overheads, and then they have to take away a profit, of course. So we have got all kinds of ways.

The argument that they help control costs may have worked in the mid-1990s, but they do not hold up today. Premiums have increased 50 percent in the last 5 years and are projected to go up as much as 15 to 20 percent per year in the foreseeable future. So the insurance companies, everybody says, well, oh, they are so efficient and they are so creative and the private sector can do all this. They are not doing a thing. It is totally out of control.

The second place that we spend more money than we need to is with drug companies. They are the single most profitable industry in this country. We have seen recently two companies that have had to go back and kind of recalculate because they were playing with the numbers a little bit, but the profit margin as an industry has been 16 percent. If we put money into the drug industry, we can get 16 percent a year. That has been the average over the last few years. On revenues of about \$200 billion a year, they make money. Do not ever listen to their crying.

They are right out there. They had a fundraiser for the Republicans the other day. The president of a British company, his pharmaceutical company came in, laid down a quarter of a million dollars, and they said, well, if you are going to lay down that much, why do you not be chairman. They raised \$30 million. If my colleagues do not think that affects what goes on the floor of this House, they do not understand how this place works.

The argument that they need these profits to continue research into new drugs is very questionable, not when so much money for the development of the drugs has been done by the Federal Government itself through the National Institutes of Health and the government pays for the trials and everything else.

They spend three times as much on marketing as they do on research and development. Every time a person opens the newspaper and there is a full-page ad that says if you feel this in your stomach, you should go to your doctor and get X, Y, Z drug, that is where that advertising is going. They are direct-advertising to the American people. The people then go to the doctor and say, well, I should have that drug I saw in the newspaper, it is right there, here is the ad, doctor.

That costs us money. Whether that is necessary or not, they are doing advertising just like selling cars and Coca-Cola and new clothes and whatever. They are just like every other company and they are using three times as much. Do not forget that, three times as much for advertising as they spend on research. They always say, well, if we clamp down on our profits, we will not have any money to develop any more new magic drugs. Nonsense. They are taking us for a ride.

I think it is time, and I think the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is absolutely correct in bringing up the issue again of a universal health care plan for this country. We should have health insurance that can never be taken away. We can do it a lot of different ways.

I have one plan that I have been pushing for 10 years, but there are other ways to do it. Why do we not say in Medicare, if you are 50 years old, between 50 and 65, you can buy into Medicare. If you get laid off by your company or you get an early out for retirement or whatever, you can buy into Medicare. It is a good deal and you have guaranteed coverage. My brother is, I forget, 56 or 57. He is at Boeing. Boeing's laid off 30,000 people. My brother's 57 years old and he is going to go out and he is going to find insurance as an individual? How? Do my colleagues know how much it costs? Most people cannot afford it even when they are working to buy an individual policy. That is why we buy group policies, but to do it on an individual policy, on our own, when a person is unemployed, is simply not possible.

So why not let my brother buy into Social Security early or buy into Medi-

care early? Or we could say, let us start with all the children and we could work our way up. There are many ways to do it. It is simply what is lacking in this House is the will to do it.

We know it can be done. It is done all over the world, and yet when it comes to this issue, we will not look over and see how the Germans do it or how the Canadians do it or how the British do it or how the Australians do it or the Japanese. We say no, our way is the best way, and we have got 44 million people without health insurance and we have got people bankrupted all the time. It is a disgrace, and we must begin to work on this, and I commend the gentlewoman for bringing this issue to the floor.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, next I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), a colleague who has been a tremendous champion on advocating for the uninsured and advocating for universal health care.

□ 1900

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, let me first and foremost enthusiastically and with a great deal of appreciation commend the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) for her leadership in bringing this issue to the fore, to the United States House of Representatives, and certainly to the United States of America.

It is unconscionable, I believe, that there are over 40 million people in the country who are living without insurance. That is over 14 percent of the population of the most advanced nation of the world.

I am a Member of the Democratic Party. This House represents, for the most part, a two-party system, and of course, we have a list of sundry Independents and Libertarians, et cetera, but it is like the mathematical axiom that the whole equals the sum of its parts, and there is not a Member in this House who does not have universal health care.

We pay a pittance of a fee on an annual basis and we have top-drawer medical care, emergency care, we get all kinds of physical examinations, and it is just wonderful. So if anyone wonders why we stay here sometimes until 2 a.m. in the morning debating issues that have nothing to do with anything, it is probably because we have good insurance and we do not want to walk off and leave it. I am just going to be perfectly honest about it.

I am very concerned about all the women in this country. We had welfare reform, which was needed in a lot of ways, but we threw a lot of women out into the job market with no insurance. They have children who are uninsured.

I come from the State of Indiana, where there are countless people who are in dire need. Something happens unexpectedly and they need emergency medical attention. Our urban hospitals are on the brink of bankruptcy right now. We have one large caregiver of the

indigent, a hospital, who can dispatch an ambulance out to an emergency situation. When the ambulance returns, if that person is uninsured, oftentimes that person gets turned away at the emergency room even though they are in dire need of emergency medical care.

In Indiana, there are over 625,000 non-elderly people without access to insurance. I say non-elderly because those over the age of 65 have access to medical care through Medicare, no matter what their income level might be. One constituent wrote to me saying that in the span of 18 months her husband died, she broke her ankle and foot in two different accidents, and she could no longer walk. She is losing her job. She has not been able to find a new job. Her preteen child was diagnosed as having a moderate mental handicap. She cannot get insurance. Her bills are piling up. If it were not for her church, she would not be able to even feed her daughter and herself.

These are the kind of people that represent a major segment of the population, not just in my district of Indianapolis or in my State of Indiana, but in the United States as a whole.

We have corporate greed that has knocked so many people out of work. WorldCom, 17,000 people, boom, unemployed. People who wanted to work, who enjoyed going to work and being responsible, American citizens who paid their taxes, abruptly, suddenly, without notice, unemployed and uninsured.

The number of young people under the age of 18 who are uninsured in Indiana is like 167,600 people. Now, how can we expect these young people to be productive members of society if, in fact, they have a medical condition that could be reversed with proper medical care and yet they are uninsured?

Now, there is a tendency of some to accuse doctors of being insensitive, and it is true that a lot of doctors are no longer interested in the medical field because they cannot even get reimbursed for the expenses that they apply to a patient. We have to be realistic about what is right in terms of how we reimburse medical providers.

This country has a major, acute shortage of nurses, and we do not have the wherewithal to insist and provide opportunities for people to go to nursing school if they do not have the resources.

We in this House last week raised the debt ceiling for some reason. I am still trying to figure out why Congress voted to raise the national debt ceiling. For what? It certainly was not for we the people of the United States.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, people who lack health insurance differ totally from the population as a whole. They are more likely to be young adults, poor, Hispanic, other minority cultures, or employees in small firms. More than 17 percent of the uninsured were 19 to 24 years of age, even though this age group represents less than 9 percent of the under-65 population.

For the first time since 1994, when the Congressional Research Service first began this annual analysis, the percentage of the uninsured who were white fell below 50 percent. Also for the first time since 1994, more than three-quarters of the uninsured were above the poverty level. The poor accounted for 12 percent of the under-65 population, but represented 24 percent of the uninsured.

About 76 percent of the uninsured were native citizens, and 27 percent worked or were dependents of workers in small firms. More than half were full-time, full-year workers or their dependents; 27 percent had less than full-time attachment to the labor force; and 17 percent had no labor force ties at all.

We need to ensure that even women who have cardiovascular disease, even though they may not be insured, can have access to quality medical care. I stand here today as an example of the benefits of quality medical care when a woman like me finds herself confronted with a very critical and serious medical situation diagnosed as a cardiovascular problem. More women than we can count are dying every year with cardiovascular disease and heart attacks. Many of them are uninsured, and they avoid going to see about how they are feeling and why they are having the symptoms because they cannot afford it.

A lot of people who work lost their insurance and are now losing their assets because of the spiraling costs of medical insurance, which wiped them out. They do not have any way to compensate for their medical needs. We need to make sure that the uninsured have access to health care, that it is affordable, and that it covers all the people all of the time within this great country of ours.

When I first came to Congress, I introduced legislation calling for universal health care. I believe that this country of ours, this superpower nation, can actually access the resources when it needs the resources. It makes it happen. And certainly one of the priorities that this Congress should have is to ensure that we the people, all of the people, regardless of who they are, where they are, how they look and how they do not look have access to insurance and that they become insured for the benefit of getting quality medical care whenever and however it may be needed.

I applaud the gentlewoman once again for her keen interest, her compassion, her concern, and her incredible leadership in this regard.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues who have joined me this evening to share their concerns about this issue and offer practical solutions to the problem.

Before I close, I would like to discuss a couple of measures that are or have the capacity to reignite the debate on the uninsured and health care for all. One was just referenced by the gentle-

woman from Indiana, and that is House Concurrent Resolution 99. It is a resolution that was crafted by the Universal Health Care Task Force, of which I am a member.

This resolution directs Congress to enact legislation by October of 2004 that provides access to comprehensive health care for all Americans. The resolution designates 14 separate principles that would guide us in that process. They include issues such as affordability and removal of financial barriers to access to care, cost efficiency, comprehensive care, including making mental health parity a priority, and promotion of prevention and early intervention. Our health care system should eliminate disparities in access to quality health care.

One of the other guiding principles is that it should address the needs of people with special health care needs and underserved populations in rural and urban areas. These are basic guiding values that we should look to as we reform our health care system.

Now, my colleagues and I mentioned various approaches to assuring health care for all and addressing the needs of the uninsured. I have offered universal health care legislation, as have a number of our speakers here this evening, and I have certainly cosponsored many of their bills. All of these bills abide by the principles that I just outlined and are an effort to reach the goal of health care coverage for all.

The legislation that I have offered achieves this goal by allowing the States to decide for themselves how to provide quality, affordable health care to all of their residents, and it provides broad Federal guidelines and financial assistance. My Health Security for All Act will secure health insurance for all Americans, guarantee affordable health care by limiting out-of-pocket expenses, and provide comprehensive health care by guaranteeing a minimum benefit package equal to the benefits offered to Members of Congress. It would also ensure the quality of health care benefits by providing very strong patient protections.

This is a proposed answer to our uninsured crisis, and I know my colleagues with me tonight share my commitment to addressing the needs of the uninsured and those underinsured in this country.

I would like to reiterate the point that being uninsured is not a choice. Over 40 million people do not have access to quality, affordable health care in America not because they choose that, but because circumstances beyond their control result in their inability to access affordable health insurance. Our country has the most expensive health care system in the world, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) brilliantly outlined that in his remarks. This is in terms of absolute costs, per capita costs, and percentage of gross domestic product.

Despite being the first in spending in the United States, the World Health

Organization has ranked the United States number 37 among nations in this world in terms of meeting the health care needs of its people. More and more people are slipping through the cracks in the system of health care coverage in our Nation.

So what are the consequences for all of us in having tens of millions of Americans uninsured? We have a sicker population, we as a society have to assume the loss of productivity and the costs for serious medical conditions that go undiagnosed and untreated. We suffer the shame of being the richest nation on Earth that cannot provide basic health care to all of its citizens.

In just a few decades, we have put astronauts on the moon, we have created a global village united by computer technology, we have perfected travel from one end of the world to the other in mere hours, and yet 40 million of us cannot afford or cannot get health care. And there are tens of millions of Americans who have lost faith in this system, lost faith that comprehensive, quality health care will be available to them without a struggle when they need it, where they need it, and from whom they want it.

My colleagues, it is time to put health care for all at the top of our national agenda. Many people have called for it and many more believe it should happen. But universal health care will never happen until we create the national will to make it so. We know that if 40 million uninsured people found their political voice tomorrow, and spoke as one and demanded universal health care, that we would have it.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in helping them find their voices. The voters in my district are tired of hearing "we cannot." They reject the cynicism of the naysayers and the keepers of the status quo. I ask these naysayers if you are not for health care for all, who would you leave behind? If you agree that everyone should have health care and affordable access to quality comprehensive health care, then let us talk about the best way to achieve that. That is why we are here tonight. Together we must reignite the debate about extending quality, affordable, comprehensive health care to everyone in our country.

JUSTICE FOR WORLD WAR II POWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here today to address the situation of our former American POWs who fought in the Pacific Theater during World War II. My commitment to addressing these issues is deep-seated. I am proud to be a co-author of the bill H.R. 1198, the Justice for U.S. Prisoners of War Act of 2001, with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER). We are joined by 226 of our House colleagues on this bill.

I am a teacher by training, and I am not an expert on the issue of war and the atrocities that all too often accompany the prosecution of war between nations. I want to share with Members why I think it is important to pay attention to events that happened over 50 years ago.

My involvement in the pursuit of justice for American POWs stems from something that is deeply personal and uniquely American. It is a view that is held by a great many of us that are part of the new generation of Asian Americans whose parents were born in the United States.

The roots of my involvement in the POW reparation movement was embedded in me as a youth, well before I had any idea about the atrocities that some Japanese companies visited upon our servicemen during World War II.

Like many Japanese American families, my family and relatives were interned in a camp in Amache, Colorado, in 1942. We were eventually able to leave the camp because my father volunteered to serve in the Navy's military intelligence service.

Later in the 1970s and 1980s, the Japanese American redress movement focused the United States on coming to terms with the injustices of the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. This shaped my desire to set the record straight.

It was once taboo in my community to discuss the internment issues. The redress movement brought the issue out into the open and allowed the healing process to begin, and this enabled many of us to put aside our bitterness and understand clearly what happened to us in our own country during World War II.

Just as the healing process began in my community, it is my great hope that this historic bill will bring some measure of closure for our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who were so severely mistreated as prisoners of war while educating our Nation about what really happened during World War II so that together we can learn from the lessons of those dark times.

As we go forward, it is critical to remember that the relationship between the U.S. and Japan is important to our national interests and that nothing in this bill is intended to harm the strong friendship the United States and Japan have enjoyed for these many decades. But we cannot ignore the past and sweep the events of the past under the rug.

When I think about forgiveness, I think about a friend, Dr. Lester Tenney, an American veteran and POW who once told me as he was recalling a conversation he had with a fellow POW, his friend said I cannot forgive nor forget, and he told his friend if you cannot forgive, you are still a prisoner.

Dr. Tenney's story mirrors what many of the POWs went through. He became a prisoner of war on April 19, 1942, with the fall of Bataan in the Philippines. A survivor of the Bataan Death March, he was sent in a hell ship to Japan where he became part of the slave labor force in a Mitsui company coal mine. Dr. Tenney has stated and I quote, "I was forced to shovel coal 12 hours a day, 28 days a month for over 2 years, and the reward I received for this hard labor was beatings by the civilian workers in the mine. If I did not work fast enough or if the Americans had won an important battle, the beatings would be that much more severe."

It is important to stress that this legislation we have introduced, H.R. 1198, is by no means an instrument to further anyone's agenda that fosters anti-Asian sentiments, racism, or Japan bashing. What this bill will do is to give our veterans their long-awaited day in court, restore some measure of dignity to them, and set the record straight. Our intention in pushing for this bill, the Justice for U.S. Prisoners of War Act of 2001, is to support our former prisoners of war held in Japan during World War II. These heroes survived the Bataan Death March only to be transported to Japan in death ships, forced to work for private companies under the most horrendous and horrific conditions.

Private employees of these companies tortured and physically abused our GIs while the corporations withheld essential medical and even the most minimal amounts of food.

After the war, approximately 16,000 POWs returned, all battered and nearly starved to death, many permanently disabled, all changed forever. More than 11,000 POWs died in the hands of the Japanese corporate employers, among the worst records of physical abuse of POWs in recorded history.

Now, like many other victims of World War II era atrocities, the remaining survivors and their heirs are seeking justice and historical recognition of their ordeal. The former POWs do not seek any action or retaliation against the current Japanese Government or against the Japanese people, nor do they seek to portray Asian Americans in any sort of negative light. Rather, they simply seek just compensation from the Japanese companies who were unjustly enriched by the slave labor and sufferings.

The main problem these POWs face today has been the way in which the peace treaty with Japan has been interpreted by our State Department. To date, the State Department has asserted that former POWs can claim no benefits due to the State Department's

interpretation of the terms of the peace treaty.

However, other countries such as the Netherlands, Spain, and even the former Soviet Union, have helped their nationals in receiving benefits, and Japan has extended more favorable peace treaty settlement terms with those countries, and has continued to settle war claims by nationals of other countries.

The United States State Department has stood in the way of our POWs' efforts to obtain their measure of justice by the State Department's reading of the peace treaty.

In the face of these obstacles, Congress passed a resolution, S. Con. Res. 158, in the final days of the 106th Congress, calling upon the State Department to put forth its best efforts to facilitate discussions designed to resolve all issues between the former members of the Armed Forces of the United States who were prisoners of war forced into slave labor for the benefit of the Japanese companies during World War II and the private companies who profited from this slave labor.

Today, the State Department has apparently taken no significant actions to resolve this matter. It is, therefore, up to this Congress to press this issue firmly and fairly. Our bill is a balanced and fair response to the situation. H.R. 1198 would, one, pursue justice through the U.S. court system as any former employee of a private company can; two, allows States such as California to extend the statute of limitations applicable to these claims for a period of up to 10 years; and, three, require any U.S. Government entity to provide the Department of Veterans Affairs any medical records relating to chemical or biological tests conducted on any POW and make those available to the POW upon request.

Since the end of World War II, the Japanese corporations that abused these former POWs profited from their forced labor have prospered enormously. Many of these companies are household names in the United States. As an ethical and moral matter, they long ago they should have voluntarily reached out to their victims and settled this injustice.

On the eve of America's entrance into World War II, former U.S. Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, Sr., once asked, "What constitutes an American? Not color, nor race, nor religion. Not the pedigree of his family, nor the place of his birth. Not the coincidence of his citizenship. Not his social status, nor his bank account. Not his trade, nor his profession.

"An American is one who loves justice and believes in the dignity of man. An American is one who will fight for his freedom and that of his neighbor. An American is one who will sacrifice property and security in order that he and his children may retain the rights of free men. An American is one in whose heart is engraved the immortal second sentence of the Declaration of

Independence: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"Americans have always known how to fight for their rights and their way of life. Americans are not afraid to fight. They fight joyously in the pursuit for a just cause."

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here today in the House of Representatives and give you my word that I will continue to fight joyously in the just cause of America's World War II POWs. We must remember these men, these men of our Nation's greatest generation. They volunteered to serve our country and some were only 17, 18, 19 years old. They were young, strong, and spirited. They survived the ordeal of a forced surrender in the Philippines. They survived the cruelties of the Bataan Death March, the hell ships, and being POWs in Japan. They survived the tortures of slavery. And today, they are surviving our justice system.

In the beginning of this year, there were only 5,300 surviving POWs, but we are losing these men on a daily basis. For the sake of these men, for the sake of reconciliation, for the sake of our future, we must do right by these men. Let us give these heroes their day in court.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me draw Members' attention to the job that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is doing for these noble Americans. He did not have to do this, but he has put enormous energy into this bill to bring justice to the survivors of the Bataan Death March. He has my respect, and I am very, very proud to be working with the gentleman on this issue.

I could not help but think as he read the definition of what is an American, that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) himself represents the essence of what he was reading: an American is someone who stands for justice first and foremost. Thank goodness we have people who are taking time to care about those people who defended our country.

Eisenhower once said that any country that forgets its defenders will itself soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, there are no greater heroes that we have today than those heroes that survived the Bataan Death March. There is no group of survivors of any war to whom we owe a greater thanks; but yet who we have done a great injustice through our inaction, through our unwillingness as a government to step up to do what was right by them.

□ 1930

There are many such causes around, good causes. This is one good cause.

I got personally involved in this because this issue happens to touch my

family. My wife's father passed away about 10 years ago, and when we were married 5 years ago, at our wedding my wife was given away by Uncle Lou, now the great male patriarch of our family, because my father has passed away as well.

Uncle Lou is a survivor of the Bataan Death March. What he told me surprised me. I was totally surprised when I heard about what had happened.

First of all, and I went to several of the reunions they have of the Mukden survivors. The Mukden survivors are the people who survived the Bataan Death March and then were sent on to Manchuria where, I might add, they not only were worked as slave laborers, but many times used for experiments and many of them were brutally murdered by their Japanese guards.

What he told me is that originally, of course, they felt that they had been betrayed by their countrymen, or at least had been hung out to dry, as you say, by our fellow Americans who they believed in. My Uncle Lou was unfortunate enough, like these other Bataan Death March victims and survivors, to be stationed in the Philippines just prior to the Japanese attack in December of 1941. They fought hard and they retreated back to the Bataan Peninsula, where they were able to hold out for months against overwhelming odds. And their relief never came. It just never came. They were supposed to hold out until the Americans came forward.

Now, could we have saved them? We had a tremendous attack on Pearl Harbor that eliminated much of our strength in the Pacific. Maybe we were not able to. Maybe with the ships and planes we had available, if we tried a rescue mission, we would not have succeeded. Maybe that was the right decision to make by our military, not to go there to rescue these men.

Then as they went through this horrific death march and captivity, which we will discuss in a moment, and then sent off to work as slave labor, those who were fit for slave labor duty in Japan and Manchuria.

After the war again they believe they were hung out to dry, because again, rather than coming to their assistance and their aid, the United States decided to cut a deal, and that is what the treaty with Japan in 1951, the peace treaty, represents, a deal that was cut with the leadership in Japan and of the way we would handle ourselves in a peaceful world.

It was a peace treaty. But instead of including in the peace treaty a consideration for these brave heroes, who had never been compensated by the Japanese or given an apology, not even an official apology issued for the way they were treated, instead of holding out for at least letting them have some modicum of justice, we cut the deal.

The deal in the treaty says that they would not be able to sue. They would

not be able to sue for compensation for the crimes committed against them. This was part of an overall thing, that nobody is going to be able to sue.

Well, guess what? There is another portion of the treaty, because that portion that I just mentioned of the treaty is always held up by the State Department and they say, oh, we cannot let these Bataan Death March survivors sue the Japanese corporations that worked them as slave labor because that would violate the treaty. All of a sudden it would open up a Pandora's box. It would just destabilize the entire relationship we have with Japan.

But, no, there is another part of the treaty, and that part of the treaty says, and I do not have the quote right here in front of me, but it says that if any rights are given to the people of any other country by Japan that are not included in this treaty as rights of Americans, then those rights that Japan has given to the other people automatically also become the rights of the Americans.

Well, guess what? Japan has permitted their companies in their country to be sued by others who were victimized during the Second World War. The Dutch and most recently Chinese citizens are able to sue, and I believe they received \$85,000 apiece in compensation.

This clearly then suggests by this section of the treaty that the Americans should have a right to sue for those crimes and those losses and to compensate them for those losses and crimes against them during the war. But instead, our State Department continues, continues, to hold that, no, this would destabilize our relationship with Japan, ignoring that portion of the treaty that permits Americans to have the very same rights, legal rights, that other citizens are granted by the Japanese.

So what we have is a travesty. America's greatest war heroes, and their greatest adversary is not the Japanese, but, instead, their own government.

Yesterday in a court in California these Bataan Death March survivors again attempted to state their case and to bring their case against a Japanese corporation which had worked them during the Second World War. It is a travesty that representatives of their government, of us, of us, the United States of America, U.S., our representatives, paid for by our tax dollars, were in that court, not to pay homage to these great Americans who sacrificed so much for our freedom, but instead to offer a brief to the court, to offer their own testimony to the court, of why the court should not even consider the case of these brave Americans.

Talking about adding insult to injury. The movie *Saving Private Ryan* and *The Code Talkers* and all these other movies that are now at last coming forward to show not just action-adventure type movies we had in the '50s or '60s, but instead to demonstrate the true heroism of that generation of

Americans that saved us during the Second World War, we have those movies, and the American people feel that we owe that generation a great debt, and we do. But what kind of debt do we have when we sit and let our government, our government, using our tax dollars, thwart the efforts of the greatest of the heroes of that war to receive some sort of justice for the crimes that were committed against them?

Do not tell me about *Saving Private Ryan*. Do not tell me about *The Code Talkers* and the rest of these, how they made you cry, when we have got people who are our heroes and went through that savagery and took the blows for us, who are now being thwarted in their attempt for justice by our own government.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and I have tried to do our best to put at least the legislative branch of government on record, to be on the side of these Bataan Death March survivors. We have tried our best. I will have to say that the President, I do not know if he even knows about this issue, but I will say that he should, and if he hears about it tonight, he should intervene and make sure that his State Department, the people who he has appointed there, do not continue on this insult and this attack on the dignity and honor of the Bataan Death March survivors.

But at least we have tried here in the legislative branch. We have 227 bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation, of H.R. 1198. The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) has worked hard on this, as I say, and I have worked hard, and we have done our best on this legislation, and that is that over half the Members of Congress are cosponsors of this bill to bring justice to the Bataan Death March survivors.

Who can stand against it, you ask? Well, we have not yet been able to get a hearing on this bill. We have yet to get the committee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), I might add, to agree to have a hearing on this bill. There is always a reason, of course. There is an excuse. But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) could have a hearing on this bill, if he so chooses. But we do not.

I would suggest that the leadership of the House has not stepped forward to try to put pressure on those that are getting in the way of this bill, to make sure we get a hearing on this bill. I would think that those people who are reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listening tonight might want to call the White House and ask the President to make sure that we do right by the Bataan Death March survivors and we quit assigning members of the State Department to go into court to undercut their efforts to sue the people who tortured them and worked them as slave labor in World War II. I would suggest even calls to the leadership of the House, or to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) might

be an appropriate thing to see if we can move this legislation forward.

But we did not wait just for this legislation. There was another attempt that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and I worked out of how we might be able to get a vote on this, even though we were being thwarted in getting this bill to the floor.

Last year when the appropriations bills were going through, we wrote an amendment to the Commerce, State and Justice appropriations bill that stated that no one in the State Department could use the funds in that bill in order to thwart the efforts of American citizens to sue the Japanese corporations that had worked them as slave labor during the war for compensation for that slave labor. So we basically were putting the essence of H.R. 1198 into the appropriations bill as a limitation so that no money could be used for that, meaning they could not pay the salary of anybody, they could not send them out, because that was using money, appropriated money, for that end.

That amendment caused a great deal of stir in this body, because we had at last got something on the floor. Some people thought that it was going to be ruled out of order. In fact, I believe the leadership felt it was going to be ruled out of order. But the person who was occupying the Chair when someone was asked to rule whether or not the amendment was in order, the person in the Chair took a look at it and said no, that is in order, and the shock waves could be felt all over the world.

Of course, it did not come up for a few days, and during that time period, the Japanese lobby went into full gear, and I am sorry to say that many Americans who you would never believe would take money to undercut America's heroes, people who, yes, it does bring tears to their eyes when they see movies like *Saving Private Ryan*, people who have made their whole lives helping the veterans, signed on to the effort of the Japanese companies to undermine that effort on our part to amend the appropriations bill, and, I might add, to undercut the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and myself, H.R. 1198.

□ 1945

There was enormous pressure brought, but when the bill came to the floor in the House, we won overwhelmingly. It was an overwhelming vote. Only 33 votes were against us.

Well, it also passed the United States Senate, the appropriations vote in the United States Senate. Senator BOB SMITH from New Hampshire put forward the very same amendment, exact wording; so we had on both sides, the United States Senate by a majority and in the House by a huge majority, voted for that very same language to make sure that our tax dollars were not being used to undermine the rights of the Bataan Death March survivors. And guess what happened?

We have a process here, which is if there is any difference between the Senate appropriations bill and a House appropriations bill, they meet in a conference committee. The rules are supposed to be that they only make changes in those parts of the bills that have a difference. Those are the rules. But, of course, who cares for the rules when they have lobbyists paying millions of dollars in order to make just one point, or when they are going to have some argument: Oh, we have to protect the stability of the relationship between Japan and the United States, because everything will just go to pieces if we permit these Americans, these heroes, to sue the Japanese corporations that worked them as slave labor.

Of course, the Japanese relations with the Chinese and with the Dutch have not gone to pot. No, only with Americans would that be considered an insult, for us to stand up for our people over these Japanese companies, huge multinational companies, huge Japanese corporations worth billions of dollars. Yes, they cannot afford to do justice by these people whom they treated like animals during the Second World War.

So behind the scenes in a conference committee where we are only supposed to change the things that are different between the House and the Senate, someone stepped forward to take out this provision. These were provisions that passed on the floor of both Houses. Now, somebody is negating the democratic process here. Somebody, I do not know who, somebody is negating the democratic process on an issue that concerns America's greatest heroes; and we need to step up to the plate and make sure that it does not happen again.

Those listening or those reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should know that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and I are planning again to offer this same amendment to the appropriations bill, but this time, we are going to draw the bead of the American people. We are going to focus people's attention on the conference committee so that behind closed doors, we will find out who it is that takes away the rights of the Bataan Death March survivors for their justice. We will find out who intercedes to negate the democratic process and behind closed doors, do this dirty deed to America's greatest heroes. We will find that out, and we will come to this floor, and we will make sure that the American people know exactly who it is that is doing this. Because the American people need to know if the democratic process is going to be thwarted, who it is here who is doing that, especially at the expense of these brave, brave men.

That will probably be in the next few months. I am not sure when the appropriations bill will be coming, it probably will be coming sometime in September, but we will be drawing people's

attention to it, and I hope that people pay attention to this issue. It is only if we mobilize American opinion that we are going to be able to thwart those who are trying to thwart democracy.

Let us take a look at that. Let us take a look at it. How many people are we talking about? After the war, approximately 16,000 POWs returned. These were people that returned, some of them were turned into walking skeletons; most of them had had the most traumatic times in their lives, both physically and mentally. They had seen their friends murdered in front of them, butchered. Sixteen thousand returned, and 11,000 POWs died in the hands of their Japanese corporate employers. These Japanese companies and the Japanese government had the worst record of abuse of their prisoners in World War II, and that is saying a lot.

Unfortunately, of the 16,000 that returned, only 2,000 remain alive today. It is up to us to set the record straight and to do what is right and to bring justice to these 2,000 men, if for nothing else, in memory of those many other thousands that have died waiting for justice, and the many thousands who died before them at the hands of these Japanese corporations and the Japanese prison guards.

Uncle Lou, my wife's great uncle, told me of his capture in the Bataan Death March at Bataan and details of the Bataan Death March and of the Filipino people who were watching this from the side. By the way, the Bataan Death March had many, many Filipinos as well, not just American soldiers, but Filipino soldiers. We are about to do justice to those Filipino soldiers, by the way, for the first time, thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) from San Diego, and some others of us; I am sure the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is on this bill as well. We promised the Filipinos who served with us that they would get veterans' benefits, the same veterans' benefits as the Americans who served in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, this is a black mark on our government again. We just betrayed them. We just took them out of the loop. I think it was in 1948 that we reneged on that promise. But these Filipino soldiers who were with us, they died by the thousands as well. The Filipino people, the citizens would see these poor people coming by, these brave Americans and Filipinos who were being treated in this way, by the sword-swirling Japanese who were cutting their heads off if they dropped out of line, and they had no water, and the Americans with the heat; it was a horror story, the Bataan Death March.

But the Filipino people would throw little packets of food or little containers of water on them. If they did, they knew that if the Japanese guards saw them, that they would be murdered, but they took that chance to help these brave souls, these heroic people. They did that at such great

risk that some of them lost their lives when the Japanese guards would come right over and bayonet them to death.

Do we not have the courage to do something? We are not going to lose our lives. Do we not have the courage to step forward, or the caring in our heart to step forward to help these heroes as they march by?

This is a black mark on this Congress that we permitted that provision to be taken out behind closed doors in that conference committee. It is a black mark that this bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and I have worked on, H.R. 1198, has not been brought to the floor. This is a black mark. This is a shameful episode.

We can make it right, Mr. Speaker, but we have to have the support of the American people to do so. In the months ahead when we bring this forward and try to put this amendment on the Commerce, State, and Justice appropriations bill, we need to have everyone there focused on this issue. I would hope the veterans' organizations, which they were the last time around, will join us.

By the way, one other reason I feel so deeply about this is that my father also served in the Philippines as one of the liberators after the war. He too had a very high opinion of the Filipino people, and he flew DC-3s up and down the battle areas as we liberated the Philippines from the Japanese. And it was a very bloody battle, and many people risked their lives and many people lost their lives. Many people remained. That truly was, that generation truly was the great generation.

So we have a chance now to repay that debt. We have now a chance to send the message that we believe in justice and even if it is justice delayed, we will do our part to try to bring this honor, this honor that these men, the survivors of the Bataan Death March who were the heroes of all of those people, like my father who went after them, it was their courage that inspired my father and others to be involved.

Let us know this: This is not an anti-Japanese piece of legislation. The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) would be the last person who would come forward and try to do something anti-Japanese. The fact is that many people in Japan, and I would say if not most of the people in Japan, understand that there were things that were done wrong in World War II.

As we know, our own Japanese Americans who joined up in our own military were some of the most decorated war heroes in World War II. Of course, they used them in Italy and in the European theater, but they were heroic. So we know that. This is not against the Japanese Americans and it is not against the Japanese people, because we know that they would like to make it right and move on.

After all, the Germans, after World War II and in the decades since, tried to make it right, some of the evil

things that they did. And they knew that it was not them, they did not do wrong; it was another generation of Germans that did that. But they have not run away from their history.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people in Japan who want to shut the book. Let these Japanese corporations, if they do not want us to go through this, let them step forward and make a settlement with the Bataan Death March survivors. Let them make a settlement. But we are not going to stand by and let them just be tortured with silence after they had been tortured and worked as slave laborers during the war. We will not let the indignity of the crime against them, and the indignities that they had to suffer, we will not let that continue and go without being addressed.

As I say, there are many Japanese who would like to see the book closed, and I would plead with the powers in Japan to step forward and just close this book, get it over with.

□ 2000

This will not disrupt American-Japanese relations. Those people who are suggesting that, they are just using lala words, meaningless phrases and words, to try to say something that would justify the insult that they are giving to America's greatest war heroes; or perhaps they have been lobbied by someone, someone who they respect or they owe a special favor to, who told them not to vote for this, or to oppose it in some way.

This is not going to disrupt American-Japanese relations. The corporations that we are talking about are worth billions of dollars. They can afford to compensate these men who they treated as animals and dogs, and beat. They can afford it. In fact, it would be money well spent, because it would establish a tie, a bond between all of us, knowing that they were willing to do it. There would be no disruption of American relations. It is ludicrous to say that.

So tonight we draw attention to this bill, to this piece of legislation that has not been permitted on the floor, or that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) has not seen fit to have a hearing on. We draw attention to the Japanese people; let us work together and bring justice and close this book. Let us honor these American heroes and recognize that the Japanese people are not the same people who had been brainwashed, as they were; the Japanese had been brainwashed for generations to react the way they did to orders during World War II.

But that has to be recognized, that there were crimes in World War II, and acknowledged and forgiven and forgotten, because there are so many things; and we have such close ties with the Japanese people now, and it is a wondrous thing.

Certainly Japanese-Americans, again, have proven their patriotism,

just with their honor and courage. And the fact that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) is one of the leaders in this demonstrates again just how willing they are to step up to the plate and be patriotic Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I just close with this thought about my father, and the many fathers who fought in the Philippines and who fought in that generation. Some of them are lost to us now. We will do what is right by them, and we will honor them by doing what is right. What is right is not to forget the Bataan Death March survivors while any of them survive. Two thousand survive. Let us not let them pass away until we have done justice by them.

In this way, we will do honor by them; but we will make sure that our own country stands for liberty and justice and freedom, and these things that the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) just mentioned a few moments ago. If we are Americans, we are going to stand for these things, and we are going to stand together. Sometimes that means overpowering certain special interest groups that maybe have influence here. But no interest group can stand up to the American people if they are motivated and if they understand what the issues are.

So let us join together and let us make sure we do what is right by the survivors, to the survivors of the Bataan Death March, and let us pass H.R. 1198. Let us make sure that bill gets to the floor, and let us make sure that our amendment on the Commerce-State-and-Justice appropriations bill is passed and remains in the bill, and is not taken out behind closed doors this time.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), for his passion, for his conviction, and for his understanding of what it is that we need to do, and for his precise words that hopefully, as in church we say, convicts us to move and do the right thing.

A couple of words I would like to close with. One is "spirit" and the other is "reconciliation."

The spirit that I have learned in this process is the spirit of the victims, the ex-POWs, the spirit that was exhibited by Dr. Lester Tenney, by Mr. Frank Bigelow from Florida, who at 6-4, as a young man hunched over in the tunnels of the coal mines in Japan, had his leg broken by a boulder that fell down and shattered his leg; no medical facilities, no medical attention.

In a couple of days they realized that his leg was gangrenous, and they needed to do something in order to save his life. The choice was, do we amputate his leg and take the chance that he may die because of that, or do we allow the gangrene to continue and know that he will die? And he said, take it, and they took it with a pocket knife and a hacksaw and no anesthesia.

Yet today, both Dr. Tenney and Frank Bigelow have the spirit and the

grace to say that they forgive what had happened to them, and what they seek today is just justice in their own court system.

The other word is "reconciliation." We just left a millennium of wars and atrocities, of the inhumanity of one person against another for many reasons. We have an opportunity in the new millennium to make this the millennium of reconciliation, of forgiveness, of healing.

I believe if this bill is passed and considered by our committees that is supported by over 226 Members of this House, that would move right through our committees if heard, that would move right to the President's desk, and to be signed by him would be the stroke that would allow our Members, the generation that we consider the greatest generation of our time in this country, to be able to attain the measure of dignity, the recapturing of justice, that they would seek and would attain when they have their day in court.

That is all we are seeking. We are not seeking to predetermine the outcome of the court action, but we are seeking their right for their day in court.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my distinguished colleague Mr. HONDA for organizing this special order to raise awareness of the former POW's who were used as slave laborers in Japan during World War II. This is a particularly important veteran's issue to me and my constituents because of the significant role that New Mexicans played in the South Pacific during World War II. I am very glad to have this opportunity to come here tonight to honor those brave soldiers who battled in Bataan.

Shortly after the United States formally declared their entry into World War II, American forces stationed in Bataan, Luzon, and Corregidor on the southern coast of the Philippines began their valiant six-month defensive struggle against overwhelming Japanese military forces. Included in these American and Philippine forces were New Mexico's 200th and 515th Anti-Aircraft Coast Artillery units. In fact, when the Japanese bombed Clark Field and Fort Stotsenberg, Philippine Islands on December 8, 1941, eight hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the 200th Coast Artillery was the first to fire on the enemy.

The superior numbers of Japanese forces, however, compelled these brave American and Philippine forces to surrender on April 9th, 1942, and then forced them to commence the horrifying 85-mile Death March to the now infamous Japanese prison camps north of Manila. It is estimated that during the march over 10,000 American and Filipino soldiers died as a result of malnutrition and torture. Following the march, the thousands of men fortunate enough to survive were subsequently placed on "hell ships" and transferred to Japan, Taiwan, Manchuria, and Korea to perform slave labor in support of the Japanese war industry.

The American soldiers captured on Bataan, Luzon, and Corregidor endured a longer captivity—over three and a half years—than any other POW's in World War II. Of the approximately 36,000 U.S. soldiers who were captured by the Japanese during World War II,

only 21,000 survived to return to the U.S. at the end of the war. Of the 1,800 men deployed in New Mexico's 200th and 515th Coast Artillery Regiments, fewer than 900 returned to the United States after the three and a half years of captivity.

Today, the men forced to perform slave labor in the Japanese corporations still await their just and overdue compensation and recognition for the labor performed. Recently, however, a California law was enacted that enables these men to seek damages up to the year 2010 against responsible Japanese companies. Seventeen lawsuits have been filed on behalf of former POWs, but their claims are currently pending in the California State court system and have been since they were filed in 1999.

Over the past few years, the U.S. government has helped facilitate the resolution of claims for thousands of individuals who were forced to perform slave labor for German companies during World War II. However, the U.S. State Department and the Department of Justice have been opposing, rather than supporting, the claims of the U.S. POWs who were forced to perform slave labor in Japan.

I am a cosponsor and strongly support the important legislation introduced by several Members present at this special order today, H.R. 1198. "The Justice for U.S. POWs Act of 2001," will allow POW suits against Japanese companies to go forward without interference from the Department of State. This legislation has broad bipartisan support and I am hopeful that we can soon bring this legislation before the full House for consideration to help bring compensation and recognition for the hardship these POWs endured at the hands of their captors.

Finally, I would like to invite my colleagues here as well as anyone else to visit the recently dedicated Bataan Memorial Park in Albuquerque, New Mexico. This touching memorial is a poignant reminder of the sacrifices made by both the living and the dead for the freedoms we enjoy today.

Again, thank you Mr. HONDA for organizing this special order. I look forward to working with you further to bring H.R. 1198 to the floor for passage.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BISHOP) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BIGGERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, July 18.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BISHOP) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 997. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research, monitoring, management, treatment, and outreach activities relating to sudden oak death syndrome and to establish a Sudden Oak Death Syndrome Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 87. A joint resolution approving the site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for the development of a repository for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

H.R. 2362. An act to establish the Benjamin Franklin Tercentenary Commission.

H.R. 3971. An act to provide for an independent investigation of Forest Service firefighter deaths that are caused by wildfire entrapment or burnover.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 12, 2002, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7827. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increase in the Minimum Size Requirement for Area No. 2 [Docket No. FV02-948-1 FR] received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7828. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV02-916-2 IFR] received June 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7829. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Addition of a New Varietal Type and Quality Requirements for Other Seedless-Sulfured Raisins [Docket No. FV02-989-1-IFR] received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7830. A letter from the Administrator, Cotton Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of User Fees for 2002 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [Docket No. CN-02-001] (RIN: 0581-AC04) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7831. A letter from the Administrator, Cotton Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports, (2002 Amendments) [Docket No. CN-02-002] received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7832. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of two violations of the Antideficiency Act by the District of Columbia, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

7833. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department of the Navy's multiyear procurement for F/A-18E/F aircraft engines for fiscal year 2002 through FY 2006, as authorized in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (P.L. 107-117) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (P.L. 107-107); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7834. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Sodium Copper Chlorophyllin [Docket No. 00C-0929] received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7835. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Status of Certain Additional Over-the-Counter Drug Category II and III Active Ingredients [Docket No. 80N-0280] (RIN: 0910-AA01) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7836. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives: Food Contact Substance Notification System [Docket No. 99N-5556] (RIN: 0910-AB94) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7837. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Status of Certain Additional Over-the-Counter Drug Category II and III Active Ingredients [Docket No. 78N-036L] (RIN: 0910-AA01) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7838. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Head Impact Protection [Docket No. 02-12480] (RIN: 2127-A186) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7839. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act—received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7840. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of justification for determination to waive section 620 (q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended relating to Yemen, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2370(q); to the Committee on International Relations.

7841. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 2001 Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7842. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's revised Reauthorization Act of 2002 and Justification for Legislative Initiative; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7843. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General of the National Labor Relations Board for the period October 1, 2001 through March 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7844. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Montana Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [SPATS No. MT-021-FOR] received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7845. A letter from the Executive Director, Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the Annual Audit Report of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps for the fiscal year ending 31 December 2001, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(39) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7846. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter regarding H.R. 4466, the National Transportation Safety Board Reauthorization Act of 2002; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7847. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Private Charter Security Rules [Docket No. TSA-2002-12394; Amendment Nos. 1540-2, 1544-2] (RIN: 2110-AA05) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7848. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations

for Marine Events; Norfolk Harbor, Elizabeth River, Norfolk and Portsmouth, Virginia [CGD05-02-031] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7849. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Northeast River, North East, Maryland [CGD05-02-032] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7850. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; SAIL MOBILE 2002, Port of Mobile, Mobile, Alabama [CGD08-02-011] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7851. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Equipment Safety Standards [FRA Docket No. PCSS-1, Notice No. 8] (RIN: 2130-AB48) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7852. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Class E Surface Area at Lompoc, CA [Airspace Docket No. 01-AWP-23] received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7853. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30302; Amdt. No. 2099] received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7854. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80E1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-12684; AD 2002-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7855. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation (Formerly Allison Engine Company) 250-C28 Series Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-12685; AD 2002-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7856. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, AS350B1, AS350B2, AS350B3, AS350BA, AS350C, AS350D, AS350D1, AS355E, AS355F, AS355F1, AS355F2, and AS355N Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-20-AD; Amendment 39-12680; AD 2002-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7857. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Hatchett Creek (US 41), Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Venice, Sarasota County, FL [CGD07-02-061] received June 20,

2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7858. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-46-AD; Amendment 39-12674; AD 2002-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7859. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, mile 1069.4 at Dania Beach, Broward County, FL [CGD07-02-057] received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7860. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model 600N Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-57-AD; Amendment 39-12706; AD 2001-24-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7861. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-94-AD; Amendment 39-12697; AD 2002-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7862. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Galaxy Airplanes and Model Gulfstream 200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-65-AD; Amendment 39-12696; AD 2002-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7863. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report in response to the direction in Public Law 104-264, Section 502, Employment Investigations of Pilot Applicants; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7864. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-39-AD; Amendment 39-12668; AD 2002-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7865. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350BA and B2 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-62-AD; Amendment 39-12664; AD 2002-04-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7866. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737, 757, and 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-298-AD; Amendment 39-12249; AD 2001-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7867. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 747-400F, 757-200, 757-200CB, 757-200PF, 767-200, 767-300, and 767-300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-350-AD; Amendment 39-12250; AD 2001-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7868. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Small Business Size Standards; Travel Agencies (RIN: 3245-AE95) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

7869. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Small Business Size Standards; Travel Agencies; Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program (RIN: 3245-AE93) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

7870. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Law, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Filipino Veterans Eligible for Hospital Care, Nursing Home Care, and Medical Services (RIN: 2900-AL18) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7871. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Name Record Information Required for Passengers on Flights in Foreign Air Transportation to or from the United States [T.D. 02-33] (RIN: 1515-AD06) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7872. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Disclosure of Return Information to Officers and Employees of the Department of Agriculture for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities [TD 9001] (RIN: 1545-BA56) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7873. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the First Annual report entitled, "College Scholarship Fraud Prevention Act of 2000"; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976 to clarify the method by which the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture determine the fair market value of rights-of-way granted, issued, or renewed under such Act to prevent unreasonable increases in certain costs in connection with the deployment of communications and other critical infrastructure; with amendments (Rept. 107-563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SKEEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5093. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-564).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. House Concurrent Resolution 408. Resolution honoring the American Zoo and Aquarium Association and its accredited member institutions for their continued service to animal welfare, conservation education, conservation research, and wildlife conservation programs (Rept. 107-565 Pt. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Sub-allocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2002 (Rept. 107-566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Sub-allocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2003 (Rept. 107-567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. House Concurrent Resolution 408 referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H. Con. Res. 408. Referral to the Committee on Agriculture extended for a period ending not later than July 11, 2002.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BARR of North Carolina, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. McKEON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 5091. A bill to increase the amount of student loan forgiveness available to qualified teachers, with an emphasis on special education teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 5092. A bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to restrict ocean dumping at the site off the coast of New Jersey, known as the "Historic Area Remediation Site", to dumping of dredged material that does not exceed polychlorinated biphenyls levels of 113 parts per billion; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 5094. A bill to establish the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. McCRERY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 5095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and simplify compliance with the internal revenue laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5096. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the St.

Croix National Heritage Area in St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5097. A bill to adjust the boundaries of the Salt River Bay National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve located in St. Croix, Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 5098. A bill to provide disadvantaged children with access to dental services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 5099. A bill to extend the periods of authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to implement capital construction projects associated with the endangered fish recovery implementation programs for the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basins; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 5100. A bill to deem a certain memorandum of agreement issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Corps of Engineers to be a final rule; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 5101. A bill to overrule United States v. Fior D'Italia, Inc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. TANCREDI):

H.R. 5102. A bill to expedite the process by which the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may utilize military aircraft to fight wildfires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 5103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain rules relating to the taxation of United States businesses operating abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 5104. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for expanding, intensifying, and coordinating activities with respect to research on autoimmune diseases in women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for direct-to-consumer advertisements of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H.R. 5106. A bill to provide for coverage of scalp hair prosthesis for individuals who have scalp hair loss as a result of alopecia areata under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, State children's health insurance program (CHIP), Federal employees health benefits program (FEHBP), veterans health care programs, TRICARE, and Indian Health Service (IHS); to the Committee on Energy

and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Government Reform, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FRANK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 5107. A bill to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 to assist the neediest of senior citizens by modifying the eligibility criteria for supplemental foods provided under the commodity supplemental food program to take into account the extraordinarily high out-of-pocket medical expenses that senior citizens pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 5108. A bill to authorize leases for terms not to exceed 99 years on lands held in trust for the Yurok Tribe and the Hopland Band of Pomo Indians; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 5109. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to convey a parcel of land at the facility of the Southwestern Power Administration in Tupelo, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.J. Res. 105. A joint resolution calling on the President to take all necessary steps under existing law and international trade agreements to respond to the serious injury currently being experienced by the United States textile and apparel industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Charles Hamilton Houston; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JOHN, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H. Con. Res. 439. Concurrent resolution honoring Corinne "Lindy" Claiborne Boggs on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Congressional Women's Caucus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas:

H. Res. 481. A resolution providing a sense of the House of Representatives that a standing Committee on Homeland Security should be established; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

312. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 28 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the citizens and civic and community leaders of Ohio to vigorously maintain and encourage positive leadership and youth character qualities by designating Ohio as a character-building state, and to request the Ohio Department of Education to seek available federal funding for character education and program development; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

313. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 211 memorializing the United States Congress to sustain the President's affirmative decision on Yucca Mountain's suitability as a permanent Federal repository for used nuclear fuel; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

314. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 142 memorializing the United States Congress to condemn the Taliban's discrimination against women; to the Committee on International Relations.

315. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 28 memorializing the United States Congress that Governor Benjamin Cayetano, of the State of Hawaii, or his designee, be authorized and is requested to take all necessary actions to establish a sister-state affiliation with the Province of Pangasinan; to the Committee on International Relations.

316. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 117 memorializing the United States Congress that Governor Benjamin Cayetano, of the State of Hawaii, or his designee, be authorized and is requested to take all necessary actions to establish a sister-state affiliation with the municipality of Tianjin of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

317. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 15 memorializing the United States Congress to support the acquisition by the United States National Park Service of Kahuku Ranch for expansion of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and of Ki'ilae Village for expansion of Pu'u'honua O Honaunau National Historic Park; to the Committee on Resources.

318. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 36 memorializing the United States Congress that the Legislature supports the acquisition by the United States National Park Service of Kahuku Ranch for expansion of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and of Ki'ilae Village for expansion of Pu'u'honua O Honaunau National Historical Park; to the Committee on Resources.

319. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 16 memorializing the United States Congress that the Legislature supports the acquisition by the United States National Park Service of Kahuku Ranch for expansion of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and of Ki'ilae Village for expansion of Pu'u'honua

O Honaunau National Historical Park; to the Committee on Resources.

320. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 34 memorializing the President and the United States Congress to support legislation to repeal the Rescission Act of 1946 and the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act (1946), and to restore Filipino World War II veterans' to full United States veterans' status and benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

321. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 26 memorializing the President and the United States Congress to take action necessary to honor our country's moral obligation to provide these Filipino veterans with the military benefits that they deserve; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 257: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 822: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 902: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 945: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 975: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1201: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1811: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 2035: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2125: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 2144: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 2282: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 2357: Mr. COLLINS.
H.R. 2408: Mr. THUNE.
H.R. 2677: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2966: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 3017: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3135: Mr. GRUCCI.
H.R. 3154: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3238: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 3305: Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 3368: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3414: Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 3584: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 3616: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3961: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3974: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3992: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. BALDACCIO.
H.R. 4010: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4084: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 4098: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 4152: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 4194: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 4483: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4548: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 4555: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4606: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BALDACCIO.
H.R. 4607: Mr. STARK and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4622: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 4668: Mr. EHRLICH and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 4703: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 4738: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 4778: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 4804: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 4831: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 4937: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 4943: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 4947: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 4951: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4964: Mr. FROST and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4967: Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 4998: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 5001: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5005: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5033: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 5059: Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 5060: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 5064: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DEMINT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5075: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WOLF.
H. Con. Res. 367: Mr. TERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Con. Res. 399: Mr. FOSSELLA.
H. Con. Res. 435: Mr. BALLENGER.
H. Res. 313: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. BONIOR.
H. Res. 398: Mr. CARDIN.
H. Res. 437: Mr. FORBES and Mr. WAXMAN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4600: Mr. FATTAH.